

A
R E P L Y
To a Pretended
A N S W E R,
By a Nameless Author,
T O
W. P's. K E Y,
In which the
P R I N C I P L E S
Of the People of God called
Q U A K E R S
Are further Explain'd and Confirm'd.

By William Penn.

L O N D O N, Printed for Thomas Northcott, in George-
Yard in Lombardstreet, M DC XC V.

Abraham
Koons Book of
Funerary
Inury y^e 19-1764
Middlesex

To (3) Jan^y 3rd 1851

W. Wm Truscott

This Birth Day

presented by his Friend in
Christ Jesus. A. Edu. & Lippincott

R E P L Y

T O A

Pretended Answer

T O

W. P's. K E Y, &c.

TH O' I submit to Controversie
as my *Drudgery*, not my
Pleasure, otherwise than as
it is my Duty, yet, I cannot
but say, I am *Glad* that the publick Con-
tradiction of a Nameless Author to
a small Treatise of mine, called a *Key*,
clearing our Principles from vulgar Ap-

A 2

pre-

prehenſions, gives me further occaſion to declare and juſtify them to the World. In the doing of which, I ſhall endeavour, with God's Aſſiſtance, ſo to govern my ſelf, that my Antagoniſt ſhall ſee it has not been in his Power, with all his ſcornful and abuſive Treatment of me, my Friends, and our Holy Religion, to provoke me to any other towards him in my *Reply* than what is ſuitable to Chriſtianity; whiſt with great Levity and Prejudice, he will by no means allow us to be *Chriſtians*.

My *Reply* will be ſhort, but I hope clear and ſatisfactory; in order to which I ſhall obſerve this Method.

- I. *His Miſtakes in Point of Faſt, and the Uſe he would make of them.*
- II. *His Inſinuations and Inſincerity.*
- III. *His Abusiſve Terms and Taunts upon us.*
- IV. *His pretended Answers and Interpretations of Scripture. And,*

V. *Our*

V. *Our Principles, so far as declared, and by Scripture defended in the Key, maintained against the Attempts of this Author, and further Explained and Confirmed for a Publick Good.*

I. *His Mistakes in Point of Fact, and the Use he would make of them.*

He begins his Answer with a Passage meerly personal, and not at all relative to the Nature of the Discourse, viz. about a Pamphlet, writ in Defence of the Bill for excluding the Duke of York, intituled, A few Words about the touchy Point of Succession: Teaching the Parliament, That when they had made first an Address to the Duke to relinquish his Right to the Crown; if he refused, then (but not before) they might not only Justly, but Civilly exclude him by an Act——When (says he) I had perused this Piece, without judging the Merits of the Cause, or the Wittiness of the Argument, I concluded that W. P. was

A 3

then

then a *Man* principled *for the Civil Liberties of his Country.*

Answer, But if I may be so bold with this Author, Pray, why then Principl'd for Civil Liberties and not afterwards? and why this upon me at all? But why at this Time and upon this Occasion, of so differing a nature, to be brought in by Head and Shoulders, as the Proverb is? But what if I never writ such a Pamphlet? (*as to be sure I did not*) what's to be said to and of such an Author in such a Case, and in such a Time, and to a Man under *my* Circumstances? Let him know then, That I did not only never write such a Pamphlet, but I am sure that I do not remember I ever read one of such a Title, or heard of it; Nor was I of that Principle, and therefore I return the Civility of his Conclusion to him again; for I thank God I was always so much for Civil Liberties, that I thought no Man ought to lose them for his religious Principles. And further, That they were never to be secured

red by *this* or *that* Man, but by a *Good and Equal Constitution of Government*, as some Papers by me, which I writ at that time, as well as divers Persons yet living, of good Reputation, can evidence for me.

But his next Paragraph explains the Matter, wherein he speaks thus: *I could no otherwise reconcile the Folly of his Prevarications in the late Reign, than by imputing them to his intemperate Zeal for a boundless Liberty of Conscience (according to the Doctrine of K. James's Declaration).*

In this he would be Charitable, but let him first be just. If there were no Prevarications, then there is no need of an intemperate Zeal for Liberty to shadow or reconcile them to my former Principles. And I am so much a Friend to him and his Brethren, that I wish them free from all *Intemperance* and *Prevarications* too, and that in *all* Reigns. And if it be possible, or worth while to reconcile him better to my Conduct, let him peruse my *Great Case of Liberty*

of *Conscience*, printed 1671. and my Letter to the *Eſtates of Embden*, 1672. and my *Preſent State of England*, 1675. and he will find I was the ſame Man then, and acted by the ſame Principles. Not more intemperate in the Reign that favoured it, than in the Reign I contended with, that did not favour it : And no Man but a *Perſecutor*, which I count a *Beaſt of Prey*, and a declared Enemy to Mankind, can without great Injuſtice or Ingratitude Reproach that part I had in K. *James's* Court : For I think I may ſay, without Vanity, upon this Provocation, I endeavoured at leaſt to do ſome Good at my own Coſt, and would have been glad to have done more : I am very ſure I intended, and I think I did harm to none, neither Parties nor private Perſons, *my own Family excepted*; for which I doubt not this Author's Pardon, ſince he ſhews himſelf ſo little concerned for the Maſter of it.

Page 8. Our Adverſary miſſes again notoriously in Point of Fact, when he Charges

Charges me, of *Revenging my self upon*
J. Faldo and T. Hicks, for baffling of
me 20 Years ago.

Answer, I had no Revenge in my Eye
 when I writ that *Key*; for 'twas writ
 in Pity, not in Anger; to inform and
 not to be revenged. I must beg my
 Reader to peruse it, who then can best
 judge if it tastes of that rank Spirit,
 and what Spirit this Man is of, that
 shews such Indignation at it; as well
 as see how meanly he has performed his
 Pretence of an Answer, that meddles
 not with the twentieth Part of it, tho
 of different Subjects.

It is not in my Nature to remember
 Injuries 20 Years ago, tho' this Man
 commits them unprovoked: Nor had I
 any Temptation to it, since I had all the
 Satisfaction I could desire but their *Con-*
version. Concerning the first, I must
 refer my self to impartial Readers; and
 of the last the famous *Barbican* and
Wheeler-street Publick Disputes, do give
 this Man the Lye. For at the last *T. H.*
 did not appear, and at the first he
 shrunk

shrunk away. And if ever any such publick Dispute determined with a visible Advantage on either Side, the impartial, not of our Communion, gave it us. And for the *Encomium* he bestows upon them, with the poor *Indian*, that desired not to go to Heaven, if the cruel *Spaniard* went thither, I must say, Let not my Soul go where their Souls are gone, if they did not heartily repent of their great Wickedness against the People of God called *Quakers*, and their Holy Profession, before they dyed.

Page 9. He saith, *The Light within is no Scripture Expression, and the Nation had called nothing the Light within, but the Effects of the perceptive Powers of our Minds, that is, our THOUGHTS.*

Answer, By Nation he must either understand a Parliament or Synod, for I presume he has not spoke with all the Nation. But if the Common Prayer, established by Act of Parliament, have any share in the Sense of the Nation, or the Synod, or Assembly of *Divines*, that

that sat between the Years of 40 and 50 at *Westminster*, he will find *another* Light owned by them, than Man's *own* Thoughts: Which being all the Light within that is owned by this Opposer, I may well return upon him that Scripture, misquoted by him, pag. 43. *If the Light that is in thee be Darknefs, how great is that Darknefs—Take heed that the Light in thee be not Darknefs.*

I shall consider his abuse of Scripture in another Place, and shall say no more upon it at this Time, than that this Darknefs being our Author's Light, he cannot comprehend the true Light; but with it opposes the true Light, and the Children of it. But that the *Light within* should not be a Scripture Expression, is very strange: Pray what is *Enlightning* but *Light within*? Can a Man's Mind be lighted and have no Light there? The Light is said to shine in our Hearts: Can that be, and not within? But more of this when I come to consider his Oppositions to the Light.

Page

Page 15, 18, 19. Notwithstanding their empty Pretence, the Quakers learn their Religion not from the Light within, but from one another. They cannot name one that was a Quaker, that was not made so by hearing them, or reading their Books. That Quakerism is erected by Art, Method and Management; by Consults and Clubs; all subordinate to a General Assembly, and not from the sufficiency of any Principle in themselves either of Natural or Supernatural Donation.

Answer, This is also false in Fact, there being many that came in a good measure ripe to the Communion of that People, having for the most part the same Sentiment, as all did from their own Convictions by the same Principle, tho' mediately or ministerially. But if this Man had considered well, he would have spared this Absurdity, for who did the first Quaker hear? He will surely allow us a Beginning. However, I would have him know, No Man can see Divine Truth by another Man's Speaking or Writing, but through Divine Light,

Light, that shines in himself, giving him the Understanding thereof: For tho' the Spirit of Man knows the things of a Man, yet the things of God knows no Man, but the Spirit of God: And therefore it is upon Conviction, and not human Authority that our Religion is built. And 'tis great Uncharitableness in this Opponent, as well as Injustice, to charge a whole People with a Confederacy *against themselves* to their Temporal Wo and Eternal Destruction. That so much Sobriety, Patience, Self-denial, Suffering, Constancy through all Times and Conditions, should be interpreted *Trick, Juggling, Legerdemain, on purpose to couzen the World and their own Souls*; as this Author is pleased to render them. But to inform him a little better, if yet he needs it; those Clubs, as he is pleased to term them, that are subordinate to a General Assembly, are not Meetings to define and *injoyn Faith or Uniformity of Worship*, wherein Conscience is more immediately exercised; But Meetings of Order and Discipline,

to take Care of the *Poor*, of *Fatherless* and *Widows*, and that all walk up to the Holy Profession they make: Which, I hope, is no Argument against us, as if we embraced our Religion by Rote, and not by the *Illuminations* and *Convictions* of the Light and Spirit of Christ Jesus.

Page 52. And *W. P.* thinks it consistent with the Honour that is due to the Scripture to compare it with Roman Legends.

Answer, He would have done well to have cited the Place where I had done so ill. I must leave it to my Reader to do me justice against this gross Writer, who says one of the worst things without the least Proof. I am sure I could no more have been guilty of such an Expression than of renouncing my own Belief; I pray God forgive him: But I would have him remember *that he is* one Day to be judged for this Abuse.

I come to the Second Head of my Reply, *viz.*

II. *His Insinuations and Insincerity.*

Page 4. *W. P.* asserting in sundry Pieces, Liberty of Conscience, to be *ex Jure Naturali*, has destroyed all Morality, confounded Blessings and Curses, Good and Evil, somewhat worse than Hobbs himself; for he only asserts a Natural Liberty, but this a Divine Privilege to do Wickedness in the Name of the Lord.

Answer, He has not quoted any one Book, less the Place, where he makes me capable of being guilty of so dangerous a Principle; which, I hope, without being partial, I may say, is very disingenuous. If he can point me to any part of my Writings, in Defence of that Noble Principle of Liberty, that has not in it a sufficient Saving to Morality, I will ask him and the World Forgiveness; and if it has, I hope he knows whose part it is to cry *Peccavi*. But to insinuate I writ for Liberty of Conscience, as a natural Right for those
that -

that should plead Conscience to overthrow it, because I did maintain it in Favour of those that kept within the Bounds of Morality, is to shew none towards me.

Page 6. He very weakly as well as unworthily insinuates, a near Relation betwixt me and the *Jesuits*. First, some one of the Society may have at one time or other had a Title-Page with the Words, *Misrepresented* and *Represented* in it, which makes up a part of mine, with which he is so angry; as if Title-Pages were Confessions of Faith, or that the same Words might not be used by Men of different Perswasions. It is to say, because *Misrepresented* may be misapplied, therefore 'tis not to be used. Any man may be misrepresented, must he not therefore represent himself aright for fear of being a *Jesuit*? This, to be sure, gives a very ill Representation of him.

In the next Place he says, *W. P. Impugning the Jesuit again; he represents his own Religion as like ours as may be,*
by

by the new softning Method of Meaux.

Truly, I don't know what Religion he is of; for he has no more told us that, than his Name; but a Protestant, I suppose, at large: And yet I am ready to think I can subscribe as many of the Doctrines of the Reformation as himself. But if our Religion be so like it, why does he labour in his whole Treatise to render ours so grossly contrary to theirs? Contrary things don't look alike, for then they cannot properly be said to be contrary. And if we are of so softning a Disposition, does he well to be so very hard? But truly I think it no Fault to have a Religion unlike his, unless it had more of *Sobriety* and *Charity* in it. However, the *Jesuits* are much beholding to him, whatever I am, it being the first Time I have heard their Methods esteem'd so soft: Nor had they now had, I believe, that Complement from him, but to render us *Jesuitical*, or *Popish* at least.

Page 7. He adds, *For W. P's Scheme is, first to give the Perversion of Quakerism, and then to represent it in Equivocal Terms, after his own Way.*

By which he would have the Reader think we are *insincere* as well as *Mistaken*, and that we have a *Design upon our selves*, to cosen our selves as well as the World, in the great Business of Salvation. But what must that Man be that can have such a Design? Certainly a Fool to himself and a Devil to others: But then what must They be who render Men so absurd and impious, only to have their evil Ends upon their Character and Religion? Doubtless they must be as bad every Jot. I must needs tell him, That little Treatise was not intended for Criticks, but plain and ordinary Understandings; to remove Common and vulgar Prejudices; and in a Familiar Style, and not after the Bishop of *Meaux's* Copy, which was performed with much Address and Exactness.

He

He says, My Terms are *Equivocal*. I am sure I have mostly exprest my self in those of the Holy Scripture: 'Tis a singular and unjust Reflection, to say I did it in my own Way, for it is in that Way which is common to the Writers of our Perswasion, and according to the Language of the Holy Ghost. And it's plain from more Places than this of his Book, as p. 23, 41, &c. That he would have that little Piece of mine the Fruit of great Contrivance and Design: I know not why, unless that he might raise the greater Reputation to his own Undertaking; as he tells us, p. 5. But that will depend upon the Conclusion, which will best shew how well he has acquitted himself.

Page 11, 12. He further insinuates, *That we make the Light within the Rule, not only to direct our Belief and Practice of the Christian Religion, but to discover to Men the History of the Coming and Performances of Jesus of Nazareth, and that he is Christ the Lord; and this without the Help of the Scriptures.*

Answer, Now this is very insincere on his part: For tho' the Light of the Eternal Word be without Doubt sufficient to reveal or discover those Facts where they are not known, if God pleaseth, yet we never said the Light was our Rule to that purpose, but to judge of that which is revealed; or that the Discoveries it made were of things Past and *Historical*, but of things immediate and practical, as of Sin, in *Thought, Word and Deed*, and to be daily assisted to live *Soberly, Righteously and Godly* in this World: To *Pray and Preach*, and *Worship* God; which relating to the *Service* of Jesus, and the *Service* of Jesus being by him allowed to be the *Christian* Religion, the asserting of that Divine Light to be the Holy Rule of our Christian Conduct to perform those things, deserves not such abusive *Insinuations* and *Innuendo's* as this Author makes upon us.

Page 14. He would have his Reader believe, as if there were not one Passage in all my part of that Book called the
Christian

Christian Quaker, he can cite before it be corrected, both Style and Matter, because he only cites one which he thinks fit to correct; calling me for it a *Lewd Author*, and what else he pleases; But according to his usual Practice, he has incerted no Page to direct us where to find this Assertion. If to me he thought it not needful, I must tell him, His Amendment is as needless; for when I speak of Christ, I say *He*, and when of his Body, I say *It*: Notwithstanding he charges me with other things: But, I think, through the many Books I have written, it will never be found my Practice or Mistake, whatever may be the Printer's.

Page 23. *Since the Quakers will have their Light to be common to all Men, and not natural, there is no such thing in the Universe.*

Answer, By which he insinuates, That a Divine Light cannot be communicated to every Man, and be Divine. Would he have shewn himself a candid Author, one that desired to have informed and

not abused us, he would have first instructed himself what we have said on this occasion. By Natural we mean meer Man; His *Compositum* or Make; that is of the *Nature* of Man, as he is Man: By *Divine*, what is *above* Man, and from God, to direct Man in all well-pleasingness to him. Yet if by natural may be meant, that every Man that's born into the World has a Portion of this Light or Illuminating Principle to direct him in the Way to Blessedness, I should not very much quarrel at the Word, it being in a sort natural to all Men to have it, because all Men that are born (from whence the Word Nature springs) as certainly have it, as that they are born into the World. See *John* I. 4, 19. & *Cor.* 12.

These few Instances I thought fit to give of the unjust Insinuations and Insincerity of this Author; which brings me to my Third Head, *viz.*

III. *His Abusive Terms and Taunts upon us.*

Indeed almost every Page is fraught with them. *My Key* is a *Picklock*, and we

we are Imps of the *Jesuits*: Our Writings are *Apocryphal*, our Phrases like *Gypsie Gibbrish* and *Beggars Cant*, our Arguments *putid Sophisms*, our Leading Men a Pack of *Juglers*, *Sophistical*, of *Suborned Sense*: Men of *Trick* and *Leger-de-main*, abusing honest-meaning Men as *Juglers* do plain Country People: *Ranting Cant*, and that I debauch the Scriptures; with much more of this Strain and Style; besides that *Scorn* and *Levity*, which very much unbecomes one that pretends to correct others in Matters of Religion. I would fain have this Author to consider whether he has acted like one that has any Reverence towards God, or Compassion to a mistaken People, supposing us to be such. Certainly whether we are in the Right or no, he must needs be in the Wrong, and his Religion vain, that has no better Bridle to his Tongue or Pen: Which said, I shall betake my self to my Fourth Head.

IV. *His pretended Answers and Interpretations of Scripture considered.*

The first Perversion, mentioned in my *Key* is p. 1. viz. "The Quakers hold, "That the Natural Light in the Conscience of every Man in the World is "sufficient to save all that follow it: Which, by the way, after the Flourish of an *Answer* to the *Key* (at least as to our Doctrine of the *Light*) is all that's cited by him, so that my Explanations of our Principle in answer to this, and three other Perversions upon this Doctrine at the same time, are not so much as taken notice of by this Man, that pretends to have considered them all. But let us hear what he says upon this Perversion.

Page 7. *This is no Perversion unless an Objection made against a Tenet be a Perversion of a Tenet, which no Body thinks besides W. P. for we only say, That the Quakers believe that a Natural Light is supernatural and Saving: We mistake*
not

not their Meaning, but oppose it as an Error.

Answer, He that changes the Terms of a Question abuses his Antagonist, and perverts the Argument, which is the Case: For the People call'd *Quakers* never said, That a *Natural* Light was *Supernatural* or sufficient to Salvation; and if *Natural* be not their Term, then it's a Perversion of their Principle. For whether they are mistaken in their Principle or no is not the Question; but whether their Principle is not misgiven by their Enemies. This Author seems to make it *Natural* in another Place, because we affirm 'tis *Common* to all, or that All are Enlightned: But this begs the Question in Point of Argument, and will not rectifie or defend a Matter that is in Fact false: For besides that it is not fair in any to charge their Consequences upon others for Principles, it is plain what any People say is their Principle, is the Rule for us to know whether what their Adversaries say is so, be their Principle or not, Suppose

pose it were true, that what is Common is Natural, yet if we do not say so, it is a *Perversion* of what we say ; and as such I give it in my *Key*. For as I said before, What any People declare is their Principle, is the Rule for others to know whether what their Adversaries give for their Principle be theirs or not : Now whether the Light we call *Divine* be natural or no, shall be considered in its Place ; but that a Natural Light should be Supernatural and Saving, is not *our* Principle, but *their* Perversion and Contradiction. Waving then any more of my *Key*, which he pretends to answer, he undertakes to state our Religion and Controversie between us, in his own Terms and not ours ; which I will not say is a *Lewd*, but Foul Way of treating any People or Opponent, in my Judgment ; and I think I am not mistaken—his Words are these.

Page 8. *If any thing they say deserves Consideration this is the Point ; and of this they say, 1. That the Light within*
is

is the Rule of the Christian Religion.
 2. *That it is God and Christ.* 3. *That Quakerism is taught them by it.*

Answer, I could be glad this Author said any thing that deserved the Consideration of Good and Wise Men; I am sure he deserves their Reproof, that will not let us confess our Faith in our own Words, nor express our Religion in our own way. However, I will observe what he says, as disingenuous as it is, and not write 40 Pages upon 4 Lines, as he has partially cited out of my *Key*, and then call it an *Answer*. It is not our way of Speaking to say the Light within is the *Rule of the Christian Religion*; but that the Light of Christ within us is the Rule of true Christians, so that it is not our Light but Christs Light that is our Rule. *For in him was life, and that life the light of men. Life in the word, light in men, and life too where it is obeyed,* For Christ promises *the light of life to all that follow Him, the True Light that enlightens every man that cometh into the world.*

John 1.
4, 9.
ch. 8. 12.

world. Christ himself hath made it the Rule of his Followers : *But he that doth truth, cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest that they are wrought in God.*

3 John
3. 21.

So that Christians are to square their Lives by the Light of Jesus, therefore it is their Rule. It is the Christian Path to Blessedness. Christ exhorts his Followers

to walk in the Light. The beloved Disciple begins his Epistles, as he does his History of the Gospel, with the Divinity

Joh. 12.
35.
1 John
1.

and Doctrine of the Light; telling us, *That God is light; that if we would have fellowship with God, we must walk in this light; and that the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth those only that walk in this light; and that religion without it is a lye,* 1 Jo. 1.

To which let me add, That in his Book of Revelations, consonant thereunto, he saith, That the Nations of them that are saved shall walk in the Light (of the Lamb, Rev. 21. 23, 24.) The Apostle *Paul* makes it Universal and Effectual, in his Epistle to the *Ephesians*,
chap.

chap
prom
fest
man
ed,
Lig
kn
it,
ed
re
Li
Li
dr
pu
w
at
w
b
m
t
a
c
a

chap 5. 13. *But all things that are re-
proved (or discovered) are made mani-
fest by the light; for whatsoever doth make
manifest is light.* Now All being reprov-
ed, All have Light; and since that
Light manifests every thing that is
known, Christ himself was known by
it, and the Religion he taught, discover-
ed by it, to be of God; and such only
received him and it, as obeyed this
Light in their Consciences. The same
Light is by the same Apostle ren-
dered the *Christian's Armour*; *And let us
put on the armour of light, says he, let us
walk honestly as in the day, not in rioting
and drunkenness, not in chambering and
wantonness, not in strife and envying;
but put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and
make no provision for the flesh, to fulfil
the Lusts thereof:* Making it the same
thing to put on the *Armour of Light*
and to put on the *Lord Jesus Christ*;
certainly then Christ must be that Light,
and that Light must be Christ. But he
objects to this Doctrine.

Page 11. *The Christian Religion is nothing but the Service of Jesus of Nazareth——Nothing then can be the Rule of this Religion but what discovers to us that there is one Jesus of Nazareth, and that he is Christ the Lord. But never was any one man instructed by that Light that is in the Conscience of every Man, that there ever was such an one as Jesus of Nazareth, much less that he was the Lord, and least of all what he required of his Servants, therefore no Light within, common to all Mankind, can be the Rule of the Christian Religion, since it was never possible for any Man to learn the least part of the Christian Religion by the Light that is in every Man's Conscience.*

To the first Part of what he says, *That the Christian Religion is nothing but the Service of Jesus of Nazareth,* I shall easily agree: For the Service of Jesus of Nazareth is the Service of the God and Father of Jesus of Nazareth; and that is to fear God and keep his commandments; to love God above all, and
our

our
whol
22.
in th
T
tion
of
that
that
like
dift
and
Na
wh
kn
Bir
red
ret
Su
A
to
th
in
ca
of
T

our neighbours as our selves ; this is the whole duty of Man, Eccl. 12. 13. Matt. 22. 37, 39. That which Man has to do in the World for Salvation.

To the second Part of his Proposition, *viz. That nothing can be the Rule of this Religion but what discovers to us that there is one Jesus of Nazareth, and that he is Christ the Lord ;* I shall likewise agree upon Distinction. I distinguish then between an *Historical* and *Spiritual* Discovery of *Jesus of Nazareth* ; and so of the Rule by which he and his Service are to be known. The Scriptures tell us of the Birth, Life, Ministry, Death, Resurrection and Ascension of *Jesus of Nazareth*, and in brief of the Ministry and Sufferings of his blessed Followers and Apostles, and it must be acknowledged to be a great Mercy and Privilege to us, that we have them ; but it cannot savingly reveal Christ to a Soul ; neither can they give us the Soul and Substance of those things that are thereby declar'd. They are an exact Map, or Picture of things,

things, but not the things themselves. It is the Office of the Divine Light and Spirit of Christ to shew Men these Secrets ; and to none are they, or can they be known, but those that walk according to the Convictions of it : First, *in ceasing to do evil, and in denying all Ungodliness and the World's Lusts ;* and then *in learning to do well, and living soberly, righteously and godlily in this present World.* So that those that read the Scriptures of Truth, by which they have an historical Knowledge of the Coming of Christ, and so is a Rule to that Knowledge, as also to the Doctrines therein expressly declared, they must come to the Light of the Eternal Word to understand them, and, to see the Glory of the only begotten of the Father, as those of old beheld it, else the Scripture is as a sealed Book. Who knows God by reading of him, or Christ by reading of him, or Regeneration by reading of it, unless God is pleased by the Light of his Son, the true *Key of David*, to come in upon the Soul, and open

open to it the deep things of God ; *viz.* the New Creation, or the Regeneration of Man. Wherefore the Light or Spirit of Christ, which are the same, is the first great Rule ; even the Rule of understanding the Scriptures, which we own to be the secondary Rule : And we say, That a Measure thereof is given to all to profit with ; to lighten all and search and lead all in the Way of Holiness, which is the Way of Eternal Happiness. His minor Proposition I must deny, *viz.* *But never was any one Man Instructed by that Light that is in the Conscience of every Man, That there ever was such an one as Jesus of Nazareth, much less that he was the Lord, and least of all what he required of his Servants.*

Joh. 1.
4, 9.
1 Cor.
12.
Tit. 2.
11, 12.

In this I must dissent from him, especially as to the latter part ; for tho', as I have already said, the Scriptures are an Historical Rule, and Doctrinal too, so far as they are Plain and Express, yet the truest and most powerful Evidence

to authorize our Belief of them, is the Testimony of the Light and Spirit of the Eternal *Word*, from whence they came, and that answers to its own.

This the Martyrs asserted, as Acts and Monum. *Hooper, Bradford, Smith, Saunders, Rogers, &c.* also *Calvin, Beza, Peter Martyr* and *Erasmus* himself, refer to it in proof of the Divine Authority of them; as may be seen in *the Book of Martyrs*, as also in the Writings of these Authors upon the Authority of the Scriptures. But if the Light we contend for does not *ordinarily* reveal the History of Jesus Christ, who dare say it cannot do so? Is it not more reasonable to suppose that there may be no absolute Necessity of it, since then God would have left much the greatest Part of the World, without the Means of Salvation? Yet if it reveal that which he commanded his Servants, both to practise and preach, it overthrows his Proposition, and plainly proves that the Soul and Substance of what Christ commanded

his

his Followers, is revealed, more or less, to all People, in all Nations, by this despised Light within. And besides Experience, which I shall anon come to, the Holy Scriptures speak as much; for says the Prophet *Micha* (Mich. 6.8.) *God hath shewn to thee, O man! what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?* Here is both Duty and the way to understand it. Now this Duty and Service is the Service of God, and so of Jesus of Nazareth, who came to teach Men so to do, viz. *To do Justly, love Mercy, and walk humbly with God.* The way to know and do this is God's illumination of Man. GOD HAS shewn unto thee, O Man! How does God shew Man? *Whatsoever makes manifest is light*, says the Apostle *Paul* to the *Ephesians*, Eph. 5. 13, 14. So that 'tis by the Light of the Word, by which he made all things, that he shews unto man all things necessary to Salvation, viz. *What is good, and what he requires*

of him: What Service, Homage and Obedience he expects. So that here we have both the Universality and Sufficiency of the Light. Corresponding herewith is that great saying of the same Apostle to the *Romans*, Rom. i. 19. *For that which may be known of God is manifest in them, for God hath shewn it unto them.* Which way, I pray, does God manifest the Knowledg of himself in Men, but by the Light of the blessed Word, by whom he made Man, and without whom nothing was made that is made: *In him was life, and that life the light of men, and this is the true light that enlightens every man that cometh into the world,* John i. 4, 9.

Now that the Christian Religion is this Duty, Service and Knowledg of God, we may satisfie our selves, from that blessed Sermon of Blessings, preached by Christ upon the Mount, *Matth. 5. Blessed are the poor in spirit; blessed are they that mourn* (for their Sins, and for want of feeling Peace with God;) *blest are the meek; blessed are they that*
hunger

hunger and thirst after Righteousness ; blessed are the Merciful ; blessed are the Poor in Heart ; blessed are the Peace-Makers ; and blessed are they which are persecuted for Righteousness sake. If these States were blessed, and those under these blessed Qualifications, then to be sure such were in the Service of Jesus of Nazareth, tho' he was not then offered up, and that they knew not his History. Now that all have a Light to shew them the Happiness of these States, the Universal Testimony of all Ages and Nations assures us ; and to deny it, is to say the Sun did never shine, since there was a Man in the World.

The same may be said of the rest of his excellent Sermon : As that we should seek God, in the first place, and trust Providence for the rest, and live by Faith in his Goodness : Be charitable and devout without ostentation : Not so much as Lust in the Mind, but speak Truth without an Oath ; bear Abuses, forgive Enemies, be sparing of censuring others, and finally do, as well as hear the Word of God, and to

all Men as we would be done to. These excellent things, more naturally, and excellently exprest in that Sermon, than in the Writings of the most enlightned *Gentiles*, are yet to be found up and down in the account given us of their Lives and Doctrines by *Strabo, Laertius, Herbert, Stanly, Cudworth*, and my part of the *Christian Quaker*. By all which it may be seen, that the blessed Word, who did himself preach so plainly and fully, yet concisely, this admirable Doctrine, had enlightned those *Gentiles* with great Knowledge, and instructed them therein, and that, several hundred Years before he came in the Flesh. I hope the keeping of these Commands, and obeying the Precepts of *Jesus of Nazareth*, will be allowed to be the Service of *Jesus of Nazareth*, or else nothing is; and if so, then I must conclude, he may be served and obeyed of those that are not acquainted with his coming in the Flesh, and becoming personally an holy *Minister* among the Jews, and, in conclusion,

an

an holy *Offering* for the World. For it is very possible that a Man may receive Benefit by a Medicine, of whose Composition he may be ignorant. And in General Pardons it is not commonly known by those that sensibly have the Advantage thereof; by whose Favour and Advice the Prince was influenced to grant it.

Since then Humility, Mercy, Patience, Purity, brotherly Kindness, Faith in God, Hope of Life Eternal, Charity to Men, doing as a Man would be done to, and that with a distinct and religious reference and regard to him, that must finally judg all Men, must necessarily belong to the *Service* of Jesus of *Nazareth*, since 'tis the *Substance* of what Jesus of *Nazareth* preached, and the End of the Labour, Travels and Writings of his blessed Apostles (and that these things were in a Measure in the World before the coming of Jesus of *Nazareth* in the Flesh, and that even those that knew him and received him when he did come were those that walked up to the Light

of the Word, by which alone his inward Beauty and Glory were seen) we may reasonably conclude, against this Author, that the *Light* with which the *Word-God* enlightned Men, was a Divine, Spiritual and Saving Light, because it revealed these Truths to Gentiles as well as Jews, that had an immediate Tendency to Salvation; and that in all Ages: And that whosoever have walked according to its righteous Dictates, as well before as since the Coming of Christ (the eternal Word) in the Flesh, did so far perform the Service of Jesus of *Nazareth*, as they thereby served the God and Father of Jesus of *Nazareth*; for says Christ himself, *He that doth the Will of my Father, the same is my Mother, my Brethren and my Sisters.*

To sum up this, once more, I say, We never said the Light within is given to all Mankind, to reveal Facts done, or historical Accounts of Persons and Actions, tho' we cannot say it is not able to do it, but ordinarily the *Nature of Things*, as to *Truth and Falshood*,
Ob-

Obligation and Duty, Commission and Omission; and therefore we say, that tho' all did not foresee the Coming of Christ, with the Circumstances that attended him, as some of the Prophets did, That, being an extraordinary Manifestation of this Light, yet all had the ordinary Manifestation of it, to do justly, love Mercy and walk humbly with the Lord: And so they have now, tho' they have not the extraordinary Revelation of the History of Jesus of *Nazareth*; in which respect we confess the Scriptures to be a Secondary Rule, an Historical Rule, and a Rule of the Form of Sound Words in Doctrinal Truths: But the First and great Rule is the Light and Spirit of God, as that was the Rule to them, by whom the Scriptures were given forth, in their giving them forth: And we also affirm, The Light and Spirit of God a Rule to Read and Understand the Scriptures by; and this was plainly seen in Christ's time: For the Jews that rebelled against the Light, had the Veil over their Understandings,

so

so that they could not see his Glory, but judged of him according to outward Appearance, which was not righteous Judgment, but those that loved the Light in that Day, the truly conscientious to God, they brought their Deeds to the Light: They knew him to be the Eternal Word, manifested in the Flesh, and thereby saw his inward Glory, *to be that of the only begotten of the the Father, full of Grace and full of Truth.*

If he object, If all had this Light, why did not all know him, as indeed that is the Weight of his Objection, and other Adversaries Oppositions.

I answer, All have Reason, but all are not Reasonable; all don't use it: So all have Light, but all don't obey it. It is not the Light's Insufficiency, but Man's Disobedience, that renders him incapable of the Knowledge of Divine Truth. Christ told the Jews, *If you do my Will, you shall know of my Doctrine, whether it be of God or no.* Obeying the Convictions and first Mo-
tions

tions
our
ence
the
So th
the
Ligh
com
and
are
of
lieve
Divi
Gree
ly an
with
been
the
nor
He
who
Esse
of C
And
nam
Wo

tions of this Divine Light, will increase our Light and Knowledge. Disobedience makes an unfruitful Ground, tho' the Seed be good that is sown in it : So that the Ignorance of those that have the Light is not chargeable upon the Light, but their own Darkness, which comprehends it not, through Unbelief and Disobedience The Scriptures then are the Rule to us of the History of Jesus of *Nazareth*, and necessary to be believed where they are known ; but the Divine Light and Spirit, the First and Great Rule by which they are to be truly and profitably read and believed, and without which Christ could not have been savingly known when he was in the World ; nor can he be known now, nor the Scriptures that declare of him : He is the common Rule to Mankind, who by his Light reveals Common and Essential Truths, relating to the Fear of God, and working of Righteousness : And it will be hard for this man to name one Nation or Person in the World that knows not the Reproofs of
this

this Principle, in Evil-doing, and in doing that which is Right has not a Reference to the pleasing of him, who is the great Rewarder and Preserver of men, notwithstanding his Cavil to the contrary, page 12, 13. But I shall attend his further Exceptions.

Page 13. *They affirm the Light within is Christ; and I say then it is nothing else but Jesus of Nazareth. If they make the Light within to be Christ, and not Jesus of Nazareth, they make it Antichrist; and because they worship God in this Appearance (as they speak) they are Antichristian Idolaters.*

Answer, This way of Arguing is very dark as well as injurious. If by Jesus of Nazareth he only means what he took of the Virgin Mary, and will not consider him as the Eternal Word; But as Man, like to us in all things, Sin excepted, He is not the Light within, that we declare of and worship God in.

But this Author at the same time declares not to believe that Christ is the Eternal Word, for he seems to deny
his

his P
Wo
by
let
Chr
in th
Chr
the
him
so,
T
and
bett
Gho
tim
to h
wit
of
Go
the
tha
hun
dye
tha
the
Ch

his Pre-existence, much more that the World, and all that is therein was made by him: And how Orthodox that is, let the Impartial Judge. If he owns Christ to be the Word, God manifested in the Flesh, then I say, the Light is Christ, as much as Christ can be called the Light; and so not only *John* calls him, *Joh. 1. 4, 9.* but he calls himself so, *John 8. 12.*

This Antagonist seems too eager and rash, or he would have reflected better upon the Way of the Holy Ghost's speaking in Scripture; for sometimes Christ is so called, with relation to his Divine Nature, and sometimes with respect to his Manhood. As he was of the Seed of *Abraham* he is not God over all, blessed for ever, he is not the eternal Word, *in whom is Life, and that Life the Light of Men.* And as he hungred, thirsted, sorrowed, wept, dyed, he was not the Divine *Light, that lighteth every Man that cometh into the World:* Yet is alternatively called Christ, sometimes Christ *without man,*
sometimes

Sometimes Christ in Man, the Hope of his Glory; according to the double Respect he stood and stands in. Let not Men separate what God has joyned, which has been too much the Practice of our Opposers, to draw a Line of Reflection over our Religion, as if it denied *Jesus of Nazareth* to be Christ the Lord, because *he* asserted him the Light of the World, and as such to be in Man: Whereas they who consider him but in one Capacity, are too strict with the Text, to wring us, and so in the end draw the Reflection upon themselves. But to run this Abuse of the Holy Ghost, as well as us, so high, as therefore to style us Antichristian Idolaters, shews a Bitterness as well as Mistake, that by no means becomes a Critick upon other Men's Religion.

But that he may apply this Injustice home, he is pleased that it should light upon me, and therefore he quotes a Passage out of my part of the *Christian Quaker*, tho' not the Page. I wave the Scurrility of his Introduction to it,

page

page
give
" w
" w
" he
" ly
" m
" th
" in
the
sus
of
M
clea
ter.
M
me
" co
" er
" H
" z
" ne
" th
" G
" in
" an

page 14, 15. This is the Passage, as he gives it. "The Power, Life and Light "which inhabited that Holy Person, "which (or who) was born at *Bethlehem*, was and is chiefly and eminently the Saviour, yet he was instrumentally a Saviour, as prepared for the Work which Christ had to do in him. *By which* (says he) *he makes the Light within to be their Christ, and Jesus of Nazareth the prepared Instrument of this Christ.*

Now by this the Reader will have a clear Taste of the Justice of this Writer.

My Words are thus laid down by me (*Chr. Qu. p. 104. chap. 21.*) "We "confess that though the Eternal Power, Life, Light, which inhabited that Holy Person, which was born at *Nazareth*, was and is chiefly and eminently the Saviour, *Hos. 13. 4.* *if for* "there is no Saviour besides me, saith "God (this he left out) yet that it was "instrumentally a Saviour, as prepared "and chosen for the Work which "Christ

“ Christ had then to do in it, which
 “ was actually to the Salvation of some,
 “ and intentionally of the whole World,
 “ then, and in Ages to come ; suitable
 “ to that Scripture, *Heb. 10. 5, 6. Lo I*
 “ *come, in the volume of the Book it is*
 “ *written of me, to do thy will O God !*
 “ *a body thou hast prepared me.* By which
 it is plain with what unfairness he
 gave my Words before : First he left
 out my Quotation out of *Hosea*, *For*
there is no Saviour besides me, saith
 God ; whereby it appears that the
 Eternal Power, Life and Light was
 eminently concerned in Man’s Salvation.
 Secondly, he concealed that Scripture
 in the Conclusion of the Paragraph ,
 out of the *Hebrews*, *A body hast thou*
prepared me, &c. which plainly inter-
 prets what I mean by *Person*, and by
which, and *it* ; that he is pleased to
 change for *who*, and *He* and *Him*, to
 render me at once Absurd and Errone-
 ous, and about which he calls me a
Lewd Author, and all to naught. This
 was done of Malice, doubtless, the bet-

ter

ter to have his evil End of me, by wringing my Words to the Sense he designed they should bear. Making me to divide, as well as distinguish, between Christ and *Jesus of Nazareth*, and Christ and him that was born of the *Virgin Mary*; reading *It, He* and *Him*, which referred to the Body; so making me to intend *Jesus of Nazareth*, compleatly considered, when I plainly intended, from the Nature of the Words of the text, and those Words, and the Scripture cited by me, in Proof and Illustration of what I meant by them, the *Body* of Christ *Jesus of Nazareth*.

Thus much of his Construction of the Words he quotes out of the *Christian Quaker*, before recited: But if he will allow us to speak our own mind in our own Words, and had rather we were in the Right than in the Wrong, which does but become an ingenuous Author (Tho' it thereby appear that we are not what he had said us to be) then let him know we do not *Divide* or *Distinguish* between Christ and *Jesus of Nazareth*. Nor
D did

did we ever say that Jesus of *Nazareth* is Christ's Instrument to appear in and by, for man's Salvation; but that the *Word took Flesh*, and this is the *Christ* or *Anointed* of God; And tho sometimes the Term *Christ* is given to the *Word*, sometimes to the prepared *Body* he took, as when he is said to dye, and be buried, and raised again, &c. yet God manifest in the *Flesh*, and *Immanuel*, God with us, in our Nature, is that *Christ* of God, or *Christ the Lord*, that God hath and will exalt; the *Enlightener*, *Redeemer*, *Saviour* of the World: Both an *Offering* for all, and the *Mediator*, and *Sanctifier* of all that desire to come to God by him.

But he further urges against us and our Doctrine of the *Light within*, as what is Fallacious on our part, to draw in Profelytes, and which he terms a *putid Sophism*, p. 21, 22. viz. *Is there not a Light in every Man's Conscience? You experience one in your own. And is God Light? and Christ Light? and is not God within, and Christ within? Now this is all very true: But when from Hence they*

the
it
and
Go
and
Mo
ry
be
bei
he
con
the
wit

to
for
fai
say
of
it,
Pr
at
W
ple
a I
pt

they infer, God is the Light within; it is a putid Sophism. God being Light, and being within Men, proves not that God is a Light within Men. God is Light, and God is within other things as well as Men: Is then God a Light within to every Tree, every Beast, every Star? If this be absurd, then God's being Light, and being within, proves but sophistically that he is the Light within: And yet this is the constant Method the Quakers use to teach their People the Divinity of the Light within.

Answer, I hope he will find no cause to blame me for Imperfect, and less for Perverted Quotations: I cite him fairly and fully. Now, for Answer, I say, I never saw or heard of that way of Reasoning or Tampering, as he styles it, that he charges upon us to make Profelytes by. And I think I ought to be at least as well versed in our Way and Writings as himself. All reasonable People will readily allow, they have such a Light, and in reading the Holy Scriptures they find the enligtned Pen-men

call God Light, and Christ Light, and are naturally led to believe that their Light is from God the Fountain of Light, especially when they read the first Chapter of *John*, and that of his first Epistle also. And it is granted by this Man, *that God is in Men, and that God is Light*, but will not have it that *God is a Light within Men*. Indeed his Argument does not prove it, for it is not regularly formed to make such a Conclusion, which is his fault, because it is of his own making: But neither is it a *Sophism*, or *Sophistical* in us, nor is the Reason good that he gives against it, *viz.* Because it is absurd to say, *that God is a Light within Trees Beasts and Stars*, in that God is within them, and God is Light; therefore it is so to say that God is a Light within Men. For *Trees Beasts and Stars &c.* are not of Mans Nature and Capacity, they are not capable of such a manifestation of the Light of God, as Man is: God is in them after another and lower manner, and to other ends and purposes. But why God, who is confest

to

to be Light, and in Man, should not be a *Light then to Man*, I cannot comprehend. I do not say that it strictly follows in the Argument, but the Reason given against it is no Reason ; and Reason and Scripture judge for us. For Man being a reasonable Creature, tis his duty and the end of his being, to know and serve God the Author of it ; but this he cannot do , unless God manifest himself to him : And since this Man grants that God is Light, and in some sort in Man, to what better purpose, or which way more properly and beneficially, can he be said to be in Man, than as a Light shining there to give him the knowledge of God ? So that he is not only there as the Creator and supporter of his being, but as his *Illuminator* and *Instructor* to his well being. The Scriptures already cited sufficiently prove that *God is Light*, and *Christ is Light*, and that *all Men are Enlightened by him* : And to be sure it must be with his own Light. Now tho', with a fair Adversary, one might say without offence, that God or Christ is

the *Light within Man*, yet it is not the common way of our Expressing our Selves.

To be sure we have no such meaning in that way of Speaking, as some Adversaries strain our words to, as if God and Christ were comprehensible in and by Man, to render us Absurd and Blasphemous. But we rather chuse to say that God, or Christ, who is Light, hath *lighted Man*, and by the Light of Christ in Man, Man comes to know God and Christ: And that the Light in Man is the *Light of God or of Christ*, and not that God or Christ is the Light in Man. The Light in a Room at Noon Day is the Light of the Sun, but the Sun cannot so properly be said to be in the Room, because its Light is there; for the glorious unapproachable Body of it is else where. I hope this will not pass with the Sober Reader for a *Putid Sophism*.

He farther says, p. 24. *I may not now adays, therefore, tell Quakers their own Religion is false, without telling them*

them what is the Truth ; lest I should Tempt them to leave Quakerism for Impiety and Irreligion, and not for the Service of Jesus Christ.

Answ. We are beholding to him that he thinks our Religion a Bar to Impiety and Irreligion ; and, I wish neither had appeared in his opposing of it. The Truth he has a mind to tell us, lyeth in a few Words, upon which he bestows no less then fifteen Pages, (*viz.*) That the Light which God hath given to Men for Salvation, generally speaking, is besides Creation and Providence, the writings of the Inspired Men, of the Old and New Testament, which we call the Scriptures of Truth ; no Light, Spirit or Grace commonly or ordinarily opening and assisting our Understandings in the reading of them, but that the Light which is in Men, is the effects of the perceptive faculties of our minds, that is our thoughts, as he also tells us, p. 9. So that what we Read and Hear with our outward Eyes and Ears, is thereby reported to our Mind or Judgment,

D 4

whose

whose conclusion thereupon is this Mans
 Light within. But, methinks, before he
 had been so positive and voluminous in
 his own notion, (where he'l find very
 few abettors I beleive) he should have
 been so fare as to have consider'd what
 I have said in my Key, p. 1, 2. That
 seems to me to have more material-
 ly referred to an other Light within
 than he has yet brought himself to. I
 will give the Passage at large as it
 lyeth, that it may Speak for it self.
 "The Quakers Belief and Assertion
 "is, *That Christ, who is the Word, that*
 "*was with God and was God* (John 1.
 "4, 9. and is so for ever) *hath enlight-*
 "*ned every Man that cometh into the*
 "*World, with his own Light*; as he is
 "that *true* Light, or such a Light, as
 "there is no other to be compared to
 "him: Which is the meaning of the
 "Emphasis *True* in the Text. And
 "that such as follow the Reproofs, Con-
 "victions and Leading of that Light,
 "with which he enlightens the Un-
 "derstandings and Consciences of Men
 "shall

"shall not walk in Darknes: That is
 "in Evil and Ignorance of God; but,
 "shall have the Light of Life: That is
 "be in a Holy and Living State or Con-
 "dition towards God: *A state of Ac-*
 "*ceptance and Salvation, which is from*
 "Sin as well as from Wrath: (see *Isa.*
 "49. 6. *John* 1. 4, 9. c. 3. 21. c. 5.
 "40. c. 8. 12. c. 10. 10) And for
 "which End Christ was given of God.
 "So that they assert the *Light of Christ*,
 "to be sufficient to save; that is, to
 "convince of Sin, lead out of it, and
 "quicken the Soul in the Ways of Ho-
 "liness: And not a *Natural* Light,
 "otherwise than as *all Men, born in-*
 "*to the World, have a Measure of*
 "*Christ's Light*, and so it may, in a
 "sense be said to be *Natural* to all Men,
 "because all Men have it. For this
 "Light is *something else* than the bare
 "Understanding Man hath as a rational
 "Creature: For as such, Man cannot
 "be a Light to himself; but has only a
 "Capacity of seeing, by means of the
 "Light

"Light with which Christ the Word
 "enlightneth him. For we can no
 "more be a *Mental* or *Intellectual* Light
 "to our selves, than we are an *Exter-*
 "*nal* and *Corporeal* Light to our selves:
 "But as the *Sun* in the Firmament is
 "the Light of our Bodies, so the *Light*
 "of the Divine Word is the *Sun* of our
 "Souls; the glorious *Luminary* of the
 "*Intellectual* World; and they that
 "walk in it will, by It, be lead to Blessed-
 "ness, *Rev. 21. 24.* Of all which he takes
 this imperfect notice, *The Concurrence of*
many causes being requisite to produce
Faith; the Quakers confound these Inspi-
rations with the Light, and attribute the
efficiency of one cause to another, which
must needs Pervert all sound Judgment
of things, and make them speak incon-
sistences: As when W. P. says, Man can-
not be a Light to himself, as if the de-
niel of the Devinity of the Light within
implied any such thing; and Man has on-
ly a Capacity to see, as if the Defect was
in Gods Works in nature and in the Scrip-
ture, - and not in Mans seeing faculty.

Now

Now such Expressions shew his apprehensions are much Perverted about these things.

Answ. But this shews my Opponent to be either shallow, or worse. I would be so Charitable as to think he mistakes me, and in the conclusion abused himself. For why do the *Quakers* confound those Inspirations with the Light? We never limited all Divine inspirations and operations to the Light meerly as it is Light, as Physically, and by his natural Philosophy he seems to explain it. We ever meant a Principle in Man that is not of Man, that is variously denominated by its various operations: *Light* from discerning and distinction: *Spirit* from Life and Power: *Word*, as it speaks forth Gods Mind to Man: *Truth*, in the inward Parts, as it deals truly with Man, and would redeem him from lying Vanities: And *Grace* as it is Gods Gift, and not Mans Understanding, or Mans Merit. I shall not therefore quarrel with his natural Philosophy p. 37. When he says, *the Sun Generates all Life,*

and

and its Faculties in Bodies, but not by its Light ; for we never said it did, with reference to the Light within : Else all Men would have Divine Life as well as Light, which was never our assertion, nor a just conclusion from that which is, it being Scripture, *viz.* John 1. 4. In him, the word, is Life, and that Life the Light of Men, *not the Life of Men* ; but as they obey it : According to that clear and full Expression of our Blessed Lord, *John. 8. 12. I am the Light of the World, he that followeth me shall not walk in Darknes, but shall have the Light of Life* ; that is, Lite as well as Light. They that read him will see who keeps nearest to the Text, and who walks closest to the Rule and form of sound Words ; which we hope neither he nor any of his abettors shall ever be able to draw or drive us from.

For the use he makes of those words of mine ; *And Man has only a Capacity to see, (viz.) As if the defect was in God's Works in Nature and in the Scriptures,*

tar
he
wi
Pu
Co
Cr
Co
fro
wh
and
hav
thi
as t
def
the
cou
pla
fro
felf
else
fro
til l
pre
M
See
Wi

tures, and not in Man's seeing Faculties; he utterly mistakes me : I will not say wilfully ; but upon that he makes a great Pudding, and depends the strength of his Conclusion : For I speak of Man in his Creation, and he of Man in his Fall. The Conclusion cannot be right that is drawn from wrong Premises, and I hope he when he thinks again will think so too ; and that his Pains, p. 36. 37. might have been spared. For I hope he will not think there was any defect in Paradise, as there must have been if Man had been defective in his seeing faculty ; for even there he was but Man, and, as such, he could not be his own Light ; which is plain, in that when he Erred, he Erred from something else than himself, himself Erring ; Therefore that something else must be the Devine Light he Erred from ; in which if he had kept, the Subtil Insinuations of the Serpent had never prevailed.

Man then, had only the Capacity of Seeing all Divine Objects ; as Truth, Wisdom, Goodness, Mercy, Justice, Power,

Power, &c. which were only discernible by the insinings of this Divine Light of the Word of God. And since he alludes so strictly in his Instances from the Creation and Natural Philosophy, I hope he will allow me to say, that as the Eye of Man, though never so capable of seeing, cannot see any Object before it, in the Dark, unless an outward Light give it the sight thereof; so no Mans Soul can see Divine Objects, though its Eye or seeing faculty were ever so capable, unless the Divine Light shined in it to give unto it the knowledge of the Glory of God therein. And I have not only my own Experience, but that of good Men in all Ages of the World, according to the degree of the Manifestation of the Divine Light, wherein they agree and cannot err. Humility, Obedience, Love, Patience, Meekness, Purity, Charity, &c. are sensibly wrought in Men by this Divine Principle. Sensibly I say, for all his insensible *Dogma's* p. 37, 38, 39. as that Man is not sensible of the Divine Agency or
 Inspira-

Inspiration of the Almighty. For we know (says he) by Reasoning, but not by Sense or Conscience: Abusing that Scripture to countenance his insensible assertion, the Wind bloweth where it listeth and we hear the sound thereof, but know not whence it comes, nor whither it goes; which is not spoken of the Regenerate Man's not knowing how he is Regenerated; but that other Men know it not with all their Wisdom and Knowledge, that are not spiritually illuminated and experienced in the same Work: Answerable to that place in the Revelations of *John*, that he that overcomes should have a white Stone and a new Name, that none shall know but he that has it, that is, but such Conquerors: For they that are overcome of the World, can never taste or judge of the rewards of those that do overcome it.

And very sorry I am for this opposer, that he allows Man no spiritual Senses, or that which answers to our outward Senses; and if he does, surely they are

to see, hear, smell, taste and feel something else than himself. How gross then is his Position, p. 37. *But this I may say, that neither is the illuminating, or renewing, or regenerating, or any other Divine Inspiration, immediately perceptible to any Sense, inward or outward, in Humane Nature; and if so, 'tis certain, none of these can be a Light within us.* But why it is not so, he has not told us, he cannot tell us, nor any Man else. To all which I shall oppose a few Scriptures, and then attend his abuse of (those I cited in my Key, and) me, for the Application of them.

That there is another Light and Spirit that attend Men, than the effects of the Perceptive Faculties of their own Minds, as this Man calls it, I urge that passage in Genesis, 6. 3. *My Spirit shall not always strive with Men.* A plain Proof that God strove with the Old World by his holy Spirit, which could not be if they had it not, or were unsensible of any such thing. *Nehemiah 9. 20.* It is said, That God gave them his good Spirit,

Spirit, but they rebelled against it, therefore they had it. David prays that God would not take his Holy Spirit from him, which shews it was with him, and that not as a Prophet, but ordinarily speaking; for his Transgression was too heinous for that Dignity without a course of Repentance, and a Restauration to his former State, which in the same Psalm he prays for: But 'tis evident as bad as he was, he had yet the Holy Spirit in that Sense, in which we assert a measure of it to be given to all to profit with, as the Apostle speaks, 1 Cor. 12. 7. Else he could not have said, And take not thy Holy Spirit from me; as much as to say, for if thou dost utterly deprive me of it, I shall grow Dark, Hard and Impenitent, and be undone for ever.

The Lord by the Prophet *Isaiah*, proves, That his Spirit should successively attend his People; these are his words. *And for me, this is my Covenant with them, saith the Lord, my Spirit that is upon thee, (Christ) and my words which*

I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy Seed, nor out of the mouth of thy Seeds Seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and for ever, Ch. 59. 21. And, I pray, who are Christ's Seed, and Offspring, but true Christians? and, as such, they are intituled to this Promise, and therefore have the Spirit of God, and the fresh and living Revelation of it, whose words are Spirit and Life.

Thus the Prophet, Chap. 44. 3. I will pour water upon him that is Thirsty, and floods upon the dry Ground; I will pour my Spirit upon thy Seed, and my Blessing upon their Offspring. A most ample and close Proof to my Point, That God gives his Spirit to Men, and that there is something more than the Light of reading and hearing of Men and Books, or the Perceptive faculty of the Mind to instruct Men. And that, not only in extraordinary cases, and on singular and eminent occasions, which our Opponent allows, as to Moses, the Prophets and Apostles, but ordinarily, commonly, successively :

cessively : For to that the Text plainly reaches.

The Prophet *Joel* is yet more comprehensive, ch. 2. 28. *And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my spirit upon all Flesh ;* Young and Old, Hand-Maids and Servants : No Age, no Sex, no Degree shall be exempted. The Apostle *Peter* applyed this very Text to the Dawning of the Primitive Christian Days, as then begun to be accomplished, *Acts* 2. 17. Not that that which besel the Apostles and Disciples of *Jesus* in that Time, was the compleat answering of that Prophecy, for that was not *all Flesh*. Besides, the very same Apostle, in the same Sermon, v. 39. tells his Auditors, that were made up of no less than *Fourteen* several Nations, *That the Promise was to them and to their Children, and to all that were afar off, whom the Lord should call ;* so that the Gifts of the Spirit were the Fulfilling of the Gospel-Promise, and consequently the great Gospel-Privilege and Qualification.

The Apostle *Paul* tells us, *Rom. 8.* That there is an absolute Necessity that People should have the Spirit of God dwelling in them, and that they should be led and conducted by it, or they cannot be the Children of God. Ver. 1. *There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the Flesh, but after the Spirit.* Here it is the Christian Rule.

Again, ver. 12. *But if the Spirit of him that raised Jesus from the dead DWELL IN YOU, he that raised up Christ from the dead, shall also quicken your mortal bodies, by his spirit, that dwelleth in you:* So that the Indwellings of the Spirit did quicken and comfort the ancient Christians, and was Apostolical Doctrine.

Again, verse 14, 15, 16. *For as many as are led by the spirit of God, they are the sons of God; which they cannot be if they have it not: For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear, but the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry Abba Father. The Spirit it self beareth*

beareth Witness with our Spirit, that we are the Children of God, see that it is plain they had the Spirit. And I wonder what Witness Christians must have now, that they are the Children of God, if not the same Spirit, since if this Adversary say true, there is no such Gift common to Christians now, but only the *Notices God has given to all, of his Thoughts and Mind by Creation and Scripture.* But alas ! too apparent it is that this Man knows little of the Workings of God's Spirit, that so unspiritually speaks of it. Did not our blessed Lord say, *John 3. 5.* That unless Man be born of the Spirit, he could not enter into the Kingdom of God ? Was this only for the Primitive Times ? Then Men ever since Men have not been savable, for they have wanted the Means of Salvation, to wit, *REGENERATION.* And if Regeneration be necessary to all, how can a Man be rationally said to be born of the Spirit, and not to have the Spirit he is born of ; or be (as *Peter* phraseth it) a *Partaker of the DIVINE*

Nature, 2 Pet. 1. 4. But more than this, Christ told his Disciples, That the *Spirit of Truth* he would send them, though it should be a Comforter to them that believed in him, and followed him, yet it should *Reprove* the World of Sin; which could not be, if the World had not such a Measure of the Spirit, as to reprove them in their Evil-doing. And indeed all that will be serious and reflect, must confess, from Experience, they have enough of it to reprove them of that which is evil, and to bear a true and faithful Witness against every evil Way.

Memorable is that second Chapter of the Apostle, in his first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, a worldly-wise People, whose Faculties were as perceptive as our Opponents, I doubt not, concerning the Office, Efficacy and Necessity of the Holy Spirit, to know God and our Duty to him, in order to Salvation.

And what has been said of the Holy Spirit, may be said of the Divine Light: As one of the earliest Books in Scripture tells

tells us : *Job 24. 13. They are of those, says Job, speaking of the Wicked, that rebel against the Light.* Then they had it : And if They had it, all had it ; For to be sure the Righteous were not without it.

Again, *The Spirit of Man is the Candle of the Lord ; Prov. 20. 27.* but it must be lighted by that Light we speak of, or it is a dark Candle. Now God lights the Candle of the Wicked, much more is he the Light of the Candle of the Righteous.

Again, he says, *How often is the Candle of the Wicked put out : Job 21. 17.* Prov. 13. 9. Which shews it is often lighted ; and if *They* have the Light, the Righteous, to be sure, are not without it : For, *The Way of the Just is a shining Light, which shines more and more to the perfect Day.* Obedience to Light received encreases Light. Now if the Way of the Just be a shining Light, to be sure the Light is saving, or is the Way to Salvation : And so the beloved Disciple has it, *Rev. 21.* The Nations of them that are saved shall walk in the Light.

David says also, in Proof of our Point, *The Lord is my Light and my Salvation*, Ps. 27. 1. Then he had an higher and clearer Light than his own perceptive Faculties.

Again, *Thy Word is a Light to my Feet, and a Lanthorn to my Paths*, Ps. 119. 105. Which was an Inward and Spiritual Word, for it was such an one as he could find in his Heart, according to *Moses*, Deut. 3. and the Apostle, *Rom.* 10.

David also, Ps. 42. prayed that the Lord would send forth his Light and his Truth, which were the same thing, *that it might lead and bring People to his Holy Hill and Tabernacle*. This was more than Man; or what was of Man's Constitution or Composition: More than the Perceptive Faculties of the Mind.

Moreover, God declared by the Prophet *Isaiah*, That he had given Christ *for a Light to lighten the Gentiles*; which was more than Man's Wit or Understanding, to be sure. And tho' Christ was a Light in his *Doctrine, Miracles* and *Example*, yet he was and is a Light within

within also, to enlighten the Mind, as *John* 1. 4, 9. with many more, before observed. And this Light and Spirit are of the same Principle, or the same Principle that is both Spirit and Light, tho' it may be, strictly speaking, not both in one and the same Act or Operation, as has been already noted. Nevertheless the Scripture makes them to have one Operation, comparing *John* 16. 7. with *Eph.* 5. 13. For the first makes it the Office of the Spirit to *convince the World of Sin*, and the latter place tells us, That whatever is reprov'd is made manifest by the Light: And the Apostle gives this for the Reason, *because*, says he, *whatever makes manifest is Light*: An Assertion that can never be denied. And as true it is that it must be a Divine Light, that reveals Divine Truths. And because it is necessary that all should know them for their Salvation, since God would have all come to the Knowledge of the Truth, and be saved, the Consequence must be good, That all have this Divine Light, more or less,

less, for Salvation, tho' all don't obey it.

I might proceed to enumerate Scriptures through the *Prophets*, *Evangelists* and *Epistles*; but I think what I have said is a double Portion: And therefore I recommend it to the candid Reader's serious Perusal and Observation; and I doubt not but he will discern the Verity and Charity of our Principles, and the unjust Exceptions of our Opponent to them.

I come next to consider his Cavils against our Citations of Scripture, and indeed against the Scripture it self, which will not be hard to evince.

Page 41. He is angry, I say, that Christ has enlightned Men with his *own* Light; calls this very hard Names, and says 'tis the Quakers *Apocrypha*: But we abide by it; and are taught so to do by the Scriptures, that he would have the World believe we deny and make Apocryphal. *John 1.4. In him (Christ) was Life, and the Life the Light of Men.*

Now

Now
this
Wor
let m
poste
harsh
impo
T
20.
of th
of t
Spir
bath
all h
with
ness
with
that
of th
that
the
it se
said
can
out
thes

Now if this be not Man's Light, and if this Light, which is the Life of the Word, be not the Word's *own* Light, let me be blamed : If it be, how preposterous must this Man be to use me so harshly for a Truth so plain as well as important ?

The next Scripture is that in *Prov.* 20. 27. *The spirit of man is the candle of the Lord, searching all the inward parts of the Belly : That is, says he, the Spirit of Man, which God hath made, hath in its Nature a Consciousness of all his Thoughts, Purposes and Counsels within him.* But this Word *Consciousness* supposes a Knowledge, together with some thing else, that gives us that Knowledge : It is the very import of the Words : And what is that, but that Divine Light which gives Light to the Candle : For a Candle cannot Light it self, and by the Repetition of Sin, is said to be often blowed out. For tho' it cannot blow that Light out, it blows out its Enlightnings. Thus Sin quenches the Spirit ; that is, the enlivenings and quick-

quicknings of it, for the Spirit itself cannot be quenched. Now this Note of his, is so far from overthrowing our Use of this Scripture, that it establishes it, and defeats him of the End he proposed in opposing us.

Thus he abuses us and that Passage of our Saviour Christ, *If the Light that is in you be Darkness, how great is that Darkness?* As if Christ meant any Light but that of Man's Mistake and Presumption, or that we could assert God to be that Light in us, which Christ said might be Darkness: For this Man says, If the Light in us here mentioned was the Light that is good, the supposal that it might possibly be Darkness, would be a blasphemous Supposition. He is to be pitied as well as reproved, that can Rave after this manner.

The use I make of that Scripture, 2 Cor. 4. 6. *God that commanded the Light to shine out of Darkness, had shined in their Hearts, to give the Light of the Knowledge of the Glory of God, in* the

the F
God
break
with
p. 43
and E
are to
that
to be
not
he sa
postl
people
them
there
made
Conse
be in
Ligh
Oppo
Rea
P
that
flow
than
more

the Face of Jesus Christ, was thus ; That God had lighted the Hearts of men, by breaking through the Darkness there, with his Divine Light. This Author, p. 43. limits this Light to the Apostles and Fellow-Labourers ; and all the rest are to see with their Eyes, and without that Divine Light in themselves: In fine, to be concluded by their Authority and not their own Conviction ; for what he says centers there. Whereas the Apostles Mission and Business, was *to turn people from the darkness (that was in themselves) to the light* that had shin'd there uncomprehended. Also to be made *manifest* in their Preaching to the Consciences of People ; which could not be in Divine Truths without a *Divine* Light. I must leave this way of our Opponent's treating of Scripture to my Reader's Consideration.

Pag. 45 to 57. His next Abuse is, that of *John* 1. 9. about which he bestows *Room* for Reason, being no less than twelve Pages. He that can make more of them than these Three following

ing Heads, has a better Understanding than mine.

1. That the Life that is come by Christ is that we shall *out-live the Grave*; not that the Soul is made Spiritually alive to God, while in this World, by Divine Quicknings, to the Use of her Spiritual Sensations, that Sin had taken away, by bringing her under a Spiritual Lethargy or Death: Which, how agreeable it is to that Saying of Christ, *John 8. 12. That they that follow him should have the light of life*; and, *John 6. unless you eat my flesh and drink my blood you have no life in you*: (Which implies an Inward and Living State of the Mind towards God on this Side the Grave) I must also leave with my Considerate Reader, that has any Relish or Taste of Divine Things.

2. The Second thing he objects upon our Use of this Scripture (*John 1. 9.*) is our making *Coming into the World* to refer to *Man*, and not to *Christ*; which, says he, is first a Redundancy of Speech, and next dangerous; *for it is as if a Man*

came

came from an other World into this.
 Now I would have this Critick know,
 if he can be ignorant of it, That divers
 Learn'd Protestant Commentators have ta-
 ken that Way, as have some of the Fa-
 thers, and all the Translators that I can
 compass, be it into the *Latin* Versions,
 or our Vulgar *European* Tongues; as
 my Reader may please to see at large, in
 a Book of mine, called, *The Spirit of*
Truth Vindicated, from p. 52. to p. 62.
 so that he must allow we are in good
 Company, if mistaken; since so many
 Criticks and Commentators are with us;
 as Singular and Erroneous as he is pleas'd
 to represent us. But where is the *Re-*
dundancy? Why, it is, that every
Man would have serv'd without the
 Words *coming into the World*, which
 follow them. No Wonder he is so chur-
 lish to our Writings, that affords the
 Holy Scripture no more Respect. If
 he will read several Chapters of that
 belov'd Disciple's Writings, and, in-
 deed of many other of the Holy Per-
 men's, he may, if he please, make
 the

the like Exceptions. Thus that Saying in *Job*, us'd in the Liturgy, in the Office for the Dead, *Man that is born of a Woman*, &c. for according to this Critick's Learning, *Man* had been enough, and the Addition, *That is born of a Woman*, dangerous; for that it implies there are Men that are not born of Women: Which I think would not mightily recommend his Skill or Judgment, as his Exception cannot justly impeach the Propriety of the Holy Scriptures. And if this Adversary did believe that Christ made Man, he would believe he *Enlightens* him, as well as made him; and that the first Ten Verses of that Chapter refer to his *Divinity*: What he was in himself, and what he was and is to Man, as the *Word-God*, by whom the whole World was made, and Man, in an excellent manner, Enlightned, and this before any Mention is made of his Taking Flesh, or coming of the Seed of *Abraham*.

3. But

3. But he would have *Lighteth*, limited to Christ's Coming in the Flesh, and that all were enlightned then by him: Now, I will not say, he was not a glorious Light in his *Ministry* and *Miracles*, in his *Life* and *Sufferings*; for if his Disciples were by him called the *Lights of the World*, doubtless it may be better said of him, their Lord and Original, *That he was the Light of the World*. But this hinders not that he should be the Light of the World, in a more proper and immediate manner, by his shining in the Understandings of Men, and giving them thereby the Knowledge of their Duty to God, and one to another. I must refer him to what I have said in my former Book, upon this Head also; in answer to one that deny'd the Pre-existence of Christ, or that he had a Being before he was born of the *Virgin Mary*; in whose Steps this Man seems to tread. If he will read from Page 62 to P. 86. and the Reasons and numerous Authorities, these may perhaps persuade him that the 9th Verse of the 1st of *John*, wholly relates to the

F

Word

Word before he took Flesh, and as he is the immediate Enlightner of the Souls of Men. *In him was Life, and the Life the Light of Men*, Verse 4. This was neither Sun, Moon, nor Stars ; nor yet the Effect of the Perceptive Faculties of our Souls, nor yet any Outward and Ministerial Light whatever ; of all which I leave the sober Reader to judge.

Page 52, 53. As for the gross Absurdity that he would run us into, of being *Be-Godded and Be-Christed*, according to our Principle, he has shewn sufficiently he does not understand it, and therefore no matter for his wild Consequences, by which he would disgrace it: But if by being Be-Christed, we are to understand *Divine Kindred and Membership*, through *true Christening*, which is the *Anoynting*, 1 Joh. 2. 20, 27. we shall not shrink from the Word, because of his Out-crys at us for it. I have already declar'd what we intend by being Enlightened, and that our Principle is not capable of any of the wild Inferences, this Man, through great Ignorance

rance or Malice, charges upon it. But
 before I leave this Head, I must observe
 one Distinction of his, *Page 54, 55, 56.*
 That to himself, doubtless, looks very
 adroit and determining, *viz. That we are*
not enlightned by what God is, but what
God does. This is upon my saying, *That*
God enlightens Men with his own Light;
 calling me all to naught for that Phrase,
 as Unscriptural, and of a meditated Tem-
 perament, to amuse my Readers with:
 Rendring the Light, which we say true
 Christians ought to walk by, to be *no*
otherwise God's own Light, than the Sun
and the Rain are his own Sun and Rain:
 Not of his Nature, but of his Creation
 only; that I take to be his meaning, a
 little plainer than he has exprest it. To
 which I reply, in that famous and suit-
 able Text of the beloved Disciple, *1 Jo.*
1. 5, 6, 7. This then is the message
which we have heard of him, and declare
unto you, That God is Light, and in him
is no Darkness at all; if we say that we
have fellowship with him, and walk in dark-
ness, we lye and do not the truth: But if

we walk in the Light as he is in the Light, *we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his son cleanseth us from all sin.* Here I leave him to consider of this Light; whether it be a Created One: Such an one, as is not what God is, but what God does; and shall attend his Perversion of my present Use, and our common Sense of several Scriptures, cited in Favour of our *Inward Principle*: And then shall conclude my *Reply* to his pretended *Answer*, to that part of my *Key*, which relates to the Light-within.

That I may make the Point plainer to the *Reader*, I shall first lay down the *Perversion* mention'd in my *Key*, then our *Principle* upon it, with those Scriptures, he takes Occasion to twist and turn from our true Sense and End in citing them, and of which he is so conscious to himself, that to anticipate my *Reply*, he gives it for me, as I shall anon observe, and not a great way from our true Sense.

Pervers.

Pervers. *The Quakers hold, That the Light within them is God, Christ and the Holy Spirit; so that every Quaker has whole God, Christ and Holy Spirit in him; which is gross Blasphemy.* Key, P. 2. 3.

By this my Reader will see what we except against, viz. the *Blasphemy* of making every *Quaker* comprehend whole God and Christ, and Holy Spirit in him. Now I must desire him to observe what our *Principle* says to this Suggestion.

Principle, "This is also a Mistake of their
 "Belief: They never said, That every
 "Divine Illumination or Manifestation of
 "Christ, in the Hearts of Men, was
 "whole God, Christ or the Spirit;
 "whereby to be guilty of that Gross and
 "Blaspheemous Absurdity, some would
 "fasten upon them: But that God, who
 "is Light, or the Word-Christ, who is
 "Light, the Quickening Spirit, and
 "God over-all, blessed for ever, hath
 "enlightened Mankind with a Mea-
 "sure of Saving Light: So that the Il-
 "lumination is from Christ, the Divine
 "Word; but not therefore whole God

"or Christ, in every Man, any more
 "than the *whole Sun or Air is in every*
 "*House or Chamber.* There are no such
 "harsh and unscriptural Words in their
 "Writings: It is only a frightful *Per-*
 "*version* of some of their Enemies, to
 "bring a Scandal upon their Holy Faith.
 "Yet, *in a Sense,* the Scriptures say it,
 "and that is their (the *Quakers*) Sense,
 "in which they only say the same thing.
 "*He that is with you shall be in you: I*
 "*will not leave you Comfortless, I will come*
 "*to you: I in them and they in us: Christ*
 "*in us, the Hope of Glory: Unless Christ*
 "*be in you ye are Reprobates.* Little
 "*Children, of whom I travel in Birth*
 "*again, until Christ be formed in*
 "*you.*

This is my Explanation of our *Prin-*
ciple, about the Light, from the *Perver-*
sions of our Adversaries: By which the
 uncandid Dealing of this Man must be
 very obvious; since, besides his Silence,
 and that he seems to shut his Eyes to our
 Explanation and Vindication of what
 we hold, from what he charges, he
 doubts

doubts the Perversions, by Changing and Misgiving the End for which the Scriptures were cited by me: For he makes us to quote them, to prove what we expressly deny, as a false Charge upon us; and carries them, at least beyond, if not against the Instinct and Reason of their Quotations, which he knows deserves a black Name, since they were never quoted to prove *whole God and Christ to be in every Man*, or to be so in any Man: But that God, Christ and Spirit were in some near manner in the People of God. For the very Perversion runs it no farther than the People call'd *Quakers*; that every one of us are suggested to have whole God, and whole Christ, and the Spirit in us: Which is to improve, as I said before, upon the very Perversion.

Hear him, Page 58. *Christ says not here, that any Man, except his Disciples, shall have him in them; that Christ is in none but those that are in him; that he is not in Reprobates, so not in every Man; that he was not in the Galatians; that they*

must be new Creatures that have him ; so all against W. P's Purpose. But what was my Purpose, I pray? Hear the *Key* again.

“ Yet, *in a Sense*, the Scriptures say it, “ and that is their (the Quakers) Sense, “ in which they only say the same thing. What Fair or Wise Adversary would have been guilty of so ill a thing, and so easily to be detected? Is any thing plainer than, first, That *every Quaker*, and not every Man is in the Perversion? Secondly, That I deny, in the Name of that People, any such Blasphemous Principle, as that every *Quaker* has *whole God in him*, but much the contrary ; explaining our Principle, of which he takes no notice. Thirdly, That yet we own God, Christ and Holy Spirit to be in the People call'd Quakers ; but that it is according to *a Sense* : What Sense do I say it? Why, the Sense in which the Scriptures say it.

Now, *Reader*, judge thou, and not I, what to call this Man, that with so much Falshood obtrudes upon us the untruest

true
for
Qua
yet
with
touch
kers
Chr
in th
Poin
or o
by n
in a
bold
Nar
we
othe
Chr
eth e
is wi
have
Tha
whi
wer
to i
Mer

trueſt Things and unworthieſt Abuses, for the Principles of the People call'd *Quakers*. And to shew him to himself yet more plainly, he has provided me with the means of doing of it, which I toucht upon before, *viz. That the Quakers use to say, None but Believers have Christ in Union, but all others have Christ in them.* Which at least gives away the Point: For if Christ be in some Sense or other in every Man, yet he is not said by me to be in the foregoing Scriptures, in any but Believers. And he makes too bold with us also, in saying, in our Name, That Christ is in all Men; for we chuse rather to express our selves other ways, as, *That a Manifestation of Christ is in every Man, or that Christ lighteth every Man; or that the Light of Christ is within every Man;* and in so saying, I have, by many plain Scriptures prov'd, That we speak but the Truth, and that which is every Man's Blessing: And it were well all would prize it, and live up to it. For that is the *Gift of God* to Men for their Salvation, and the Con-
victions

viſtions of it, the Day of their *Viſitation*. And tho' *Tradition, Form and Formality*, in many Countries, as well as Wickedneſs, having awaken'd the Underſtandings of People, ſo that they ſeem more Solicitous about their Forms, than zealouſly obedient to this Divine Principle; yet there is none without a Senſe of the Reproofs and Convictions of it, more or leſs, at one Time or other: Which cannot be without *Light*, ſince all that is reprov'd is made manifeſt by the Light, *Eph. 5. 13*. But before I cloſe this Subject, I muſt touch upon his Interpretation of ſome of thoſe Texts before cited, *Page 58, 59*.

He ſays this Paſſage of the Apoſtles, *Chriſt in us, the Hope of Glory*, is againſt me, *becauſe it was only to Believers that he wrote*. Grant it, yet why may not Chriſt be a Condemner in the Conſciences of the Wicked, as well as the Hope of Glory in Believers? However, it is not againſt me, ſince I cited it only to ſhew the Enjoyment of Believers: And ſince he allows Chriſt to be in Believers, I hope

hop
him
the
outv
of R
nyee
here
that
Con
For
more
So t
wha
poſe
T
to th
Chri
ſays
in t
Man
ſay
Mar
mor
und
ſcier
to h

hope his Light and Spirit are there with him, which is more than the Effects of the perceptive Powers of their Souls, or outward Ministerial Help in the Business of Religion; a thing he has so often denied to any but the Holy *Penmen*, and here and there an extraordinary Person, that has had the *Power* of Miracles, to Confirm the Truth of his Inspiration: *For if he has given us his Son, how much more with him shall he give us all things?* So that our Adversary has herein granted what he has so often denied and opposed.

The like in that Passage of the Apostle to the *Corinthians*, 2 Cor 13. 15. *Unless Christ be in you, you are Reprobates. This,* says he, *proves, no Reprobates have Christ in them; How then is Christ in every Man, if he be in none of these?* But then say I, he is in all but Reprobates by this Man's Concession: And we can say no more. For if by Reprobates we are to understand a *Judas* State; a *seared* Conscience; one that has absolutely *crucified* to himself afresh the Lord of Life and Glo-

Glory, and has finned the Sin against the Holy Ghost: In short, an *Apostate* or an *obstinate Opposer*, and *Perverter* of the right Way of the Lord; then, I say, our Principle of Christ being in some Sense in every Man (*viz.* as a Light lighting every Man) receives no Disadvantage from his Objection: For, therefore, *Reprobates* have not Christ; because they have finally blown out the Candle, extinguish'd Conscience, and are become dead to all Sense of Religion; which is because they have out-liv'd the Day of God's Love and Mercy to them: They would not be gathered; they would have none of him; they would not have this Man to reign over them. But then *all others*, by this Text, and this Man's arguing from it, have Christ in them; and so it makes greatly for us, since it plainly concludes, That if all that have not Christ in them are *Reprobates*, then those that are not *Reprobates* have Christ in them; but such is every Man that cometh into the World, *therefore every Man that cometh into the World hath Christ*

in

in his
not
have
Spiri
eth,
Repe
will
Scale
Judg
Seed
all has
rathe
were
turn
My L
Birth
you :
spoken
he say
my on
the G
proba
walk
One
Christ
tho' n

in him: For, to be sure, Men come
 not *Reprobates* into the World. They
 have a Day of Grace; God calls; his
 Spirit strives; his Long-suffering wait-
 eth, as in the Days of *Noah*, for their
 Repentance. And this is that which
 will give the greatest Weight in the
 Scale against the Rebellious, at the great
 Judgment, that they had a *Talent*; a
Seed was sown, *Grace* did appear, and
 all had *Light*, but such lov'd Darkness
 rather than Light, because their Deeds
 were evil. The last Scripture he would
 turn upon us is that in the *Galatians*;
My little Children, of whom I travel in
Birth again until Christ be formed in
you: Upon which he says, *The Persons*
spoken to then, had not Christ in them. Thus,
 he says, every Proof I bring *contradicts*
my own Conclusion; but then, says I,
 the *Galatians* must be at that Time *Re-*
probates, by his. Thus does this Man
 walk in a Circle, and contradict himself.
 One Time all but *Reprobates* have
 Christ; another while the *Galatians*,
 tho' not *Reprobates*, had him not. But
 when

when he considers that there is a great Difference between a *Seed*, and an *Ear*, a *Plant* and a *Tree*, he may better understand the Apostle, and what he now says. For the poor Man, after so often allowing Christ to be in the People of God, says, Page 59. *But neither in Believers is Christ a Light within.* I wonder then what he is there, since he is the *Light of the World*, Joh 1. 4, 9. and that *true Light that lighteth every Man that cometh into the World*; and yet not to be a Light within Man, *tho' he be within Man*, is surprizing. I shall leave it with my Reader, to do our Principle Justice; and I hope he will find reason to think I have asserted no *Errors*, nor *prevaricated* with my Friends, nor *lost* my Point, nor acted with *Leger-de-main*, or a *Meditated Temperament* to deceive; and that all the *Wards* of my *Key*, after his many *Strainings*, *Wrestings* and *Forcings*, keep their Places, and answer the End for which the *Key* was first made (*viz.*) *To open to every Common Understanding, the Difference between the Principles of the People* called

call
Me
ing
Scu
Re

His

P
thes

is m
ther

eng
unl

But
the

Oat

I

few

Ev

stal

called Quakers, and the Perversions and Misrepresentations of their Enemies: Wishing this Adversary, for all his Scoffs, Scurrility and Abuse, upon us and our Religion, Repentance to Salvation.

His Exceptions to our Refusal of Oaths, And his Arguments for them considered.

PAge 62. *To their (the Quakers) Scruple about Oaths, I shall only hint these few Thoughts, because True Speaking is not only a part of Honesty, but Religion; therefore not only Honesty, but Religion is engaged, with its full Force to support it self; unless Religion may not support it self: But if a Man engage all his Religion for the Support of a true Speech, he takes an Oath.*

If this be true Arguing, then we swear as often as we say Tea and Nay in Evidence, since we acknowledge we stake the Credit of our Religion and
 Con-

Conscience for the Verity of it ; and then methinks there needs no more Dispute in the Matter : For it is certain we do, and that Swearers can do no more : And since that is our Principle, it is as binding on us, as Swearing is upon those that give themselves the Liberty of Swearing. But pray let us hear what follows. *I shall not* (says he) *insist upon the Nature of an Oath, but consider its Place in the Political State of Christ's Kingdom.*

If he will not insist upon the Nature of an Oath, I have no reason to insist upon the Use or Disuse of it at this Time ; since here it is an arguing upon an *Individuum Vagum* ; a Nothing. He should first have ascertained us what an Oath is ; and when that had been adjusted and settled, then he should have proved such an Oath Lawful, and us unreasonable for refusing it upon all accounts. However, I will both Observe and Answer his Notions of it.

First, he says, *He cannot understand how Swearing can be wholly put down, where People*

Pe
T
rec
Th
pea
ple
For
ma
tha
fire
and
ken
fits
the
of
are
I ha
p. 6
were
it h
I ha
grea
ligio
as Fa
viz.

People may Swear by Law, as in England
 True, unless that Law be Repealed, that
 requires it. But it is a great *Bull* to say,
 That they that make a Law can't Re-
 peal it. If the Legislative Power is
 pleased to make *Yea* and *Nay* have the
 Force and Acceptance of an Oath, they
 may have it in any Government, and
 that is what the People call'd *Quakers* De-
 sire in this, for all of their Communion;
 and to shew him how much he is Mistak-
 en, the highest Judicature in *England*
 sits upon Honour, and not Oaths, *viz.*
the House of Lords: So Commissioners
 of *Oyer and Terminer*, that judge Life,
 are rarely, if ever, upon Oath. So that
 I have herein answer'd his Question,
p. 63. If an Order against all Swearing
were not, Ipso Jure, Void. He carries
 it higher than any Body ever did, that
 I have met with. It is with him the
 great Hinge or Axletree upon which Re-
 ligion turns; and explodes my Reason
 as False, that I gave for the Rise of Oaths,
viz. want of Faith either in him that
 G Swears,

Swears, or in him to whom the Oath is Sworn.

For, says he, *God the Father Swears to the Son, Heb. 7. where there is infinite Faithfulness on both Sides.*

But to this I say, That, strictly speaking, God cannot be said to Swear, for he that Swears Swears by the Greater, *Heb. 6. 16.* so that it is call'd *Swearing*, that it might strike unbelieving Man with the greater Assurance of God's Love to him. And tho' there was Infinite Faithfulness between God and Christ, yet it referring to Man, it is termed an Oath, to heighten and augment Man's Credit and Confidence in God, as to the means of his Salvation, and not that God did properly Swear, or can do so.

But he tells us, *That Christ answered upon Adjuration before a Judge*, which is the way of Swearing in our *English Courts.*

I cannot allow it, since he does not prove that Christ Swore in his Answer; for all he said was, *Thou hast said, Mat.*

ath is
 ars to
 finite
 peak-
 , for
 eater,
 ring.
 Man
 God's
 Infi-
 hrift,
 ed an
 Man's
 o the
 God
 ivered
 ich is
 nglish
 s not
 wer;
 Mat
 26

26. 63. Now that is putting it back to
 the High Priest ; as if he had said, What
 need I answer that upon Oath, which
 thou thy self say'st? Dost thou first ac-
 cuse me, and then query to confirm it?
 Thou hast said. But next, if it be said,
 That it was an Answer usual, and the
 Propriety or Peculiarity of that Language,
 so to speak, he should have proved it:
 For as the Words are in the Scripture,
 there appears no Oath in them: But if
 it were as he says, which I cannot grant,
 yet it concludes nothing against us; for
 as he was in the State of a Servant, a
 Jew of the Jews, made and born under
 the Law, Gal. 4. 4. He was to fulfil the
 Righteousness of it, and so might act as
 a Jew; as he did in the Instance of Cir-
 cumcision, the Passover, &c. Yet after
 his Resurrection we hear nothing of an
 Oath, any more in Example than in Do-
 ctrin, that with other Customs of the
 Jews, that in old Time was practis'd,
 were, as it were, left with the Grave-
 Cloaths behind, and he ascended, in his
 Evangelical Righteousness and Glory,

Triumphing over Principalities and Powers, and Vanquishing Hell, Death and the Grave, and brought in a better Hope, Sanctuary and Tabernacle, where *Yea* and *Nay* succeeded and superceeded all Oaths. So that the very Basis this Man builds upon is Unsound, and his Premises precarious. How then can he build well, or conclude rightly against us? But he says, The Angels Swear, which I conceive is more than he knows; for no Body can think by his Writings he is very Conversant with Good Angels. However, I grant that the Angels have sworn, but that is no Reason to continue Oaths among Men, if Christ, the blessed Author of the Christian Religion hath forbid them: For the Angels, as well as Men must worship, *Heb. 1. 6.* and therefore Christ and not the Angels are to be follow'd by us; but whenever an Angel hath Sworn, it hath been in Condescension of the Incredulity and Diffidence of Man, and to highten his Credit of the Mind and Will of God; and is therefore an Instance for us, because

cause it refers to a low and imperfect State, proposed as an Expedient and Remedy against Untruth; which is out of the Question, Truth leaving no Room for Swearing, which in its Nature is but a Terrifying of the Mind into true Speaking; as in some Countries, in Default of Evidence, they use Racks to extort Confessions from the suspected Parties: An Instance of which we have near us, in the *Scotch Boots* and *Tumminikins*.

He alledges also, That the *Apostles Swore*; but he has not mention'd any one of them, nor any Place; However, that I may not leave my *Reader* as much in the Dark as he has done his, I refer him to my Book, entitul'd, *The Spirit of Truth Vindicated*, from p. 86 to 91 p. where he may see how much softer Translations may be given of the Apostles Expressions than that of our *Vulgar Version*. Nevertheless, those extraordinary ways of Speaking were in extraordinary Cases, and cannot be a Rule to others, but under the same Circumstances and Authority: And till this

Author has given us an Authentick Definition of an Oath, he cannot justly call the Apostles Expressions Oaths or Proofs of Oaths: Unless he will allow that binding any Affirmation or Negation by the Name of Lord, is an Oath; but if that were the Case, it differs mightily, to use the Name of the Lord to inforce the Verity of Divine Things, and to make it a Witness and Voucher for us in our Law and Temporal Affairs: A Distinction as old as some of the most eminent Fathers of the Primitive Ages of the Church,

But he adds, *That all Christians take Sacramental Oaths*: Which is not true in Fact; for among the Protestants of the *Low Countries* there is a great People, who in any Case will not Swear, as well as we, and yet we know no other Name, Blood, Power and Spirit by which we can be saved, than *that* of the Lord Jesus Christ. Again, many of the Followers of *John Wickliff*, who would not Swear in any Case; and divers also of our *English Martyrs* refused to swear; upon

on

on the same Principle. And if this Man will call to mind, he may remember, that some of the best of the *Ancient Fathers* were of the same Judgment; believing it Unlawful for a Christian Man to take an Oath; which in my Treatise of Oaths may be seen at large.

Now, for what he alledges, Why Christ's Prohibition, *Matth. 5.* doth not extend to all Oaths, I think it will not be hard to shew it is slight and concludes nothing against us.

First, he says, the Expression whereby the particular Law is suppos'd to forbid all Oaths, does frequently, in the Law-Books, signifie no more than false Oaths, or Swearing otherwise amiss; as may be seen by comparing *Matth. 5. 34.* with *Levit. 5. 1. Eccles. 9. 2. Jer. 23. 10. Zach. 5. 3. Hos. 4. 2.* But this is rather against him than for him; since if Christ only forbids what was not lawful before, his Righteousness rises no higher than that of the Law of *Moses*. But it is plain from the Text, *Matth. 5.* that Christ forbids such Swearing as was

lawful before, and therefore more than the Texts before-mention'd express.

Secondly, *Page 64.* He limits Christ's Prohibition to those Oaths which had no Sacredness in them, but which the Pharisees thought they might make and Violate without Impiety. This also is a meer Conjecture, for which he offers us no Proof; the contrary being evident, as before; for Christ treated of Oaths that were to be perform'd to the Lord, were they not then Sacred?

But, Thirdly, for his Third Particular, it is as unintelligible as his *Gipsy Gibberish* in *Page 10.* and he must explain it before it can be answerable.

His Fourth Particular is this, *When it divides this Prohibition into its part, Matth. 5. 35, 36. he does not divide it as against Swearing in all Cases, but sets the Bounds of his Distribution directly to oppose this corrupt Gloss of the Pharisees; for he doth not say, Ye have heard that it hath been said, Ye shall Swear in Truth, in Righteousness and in Judgment; But I say unto ye, Swear not at all; for so far*

as

as e
Doc
say
all
or
tran
the
be
kin
ver
as i
me
to
as t
tak
the
Oat
wa
oug
Lo
lim
Oat
the
ma
the
acc

as concern'd swearing by God the Pharisees Doctrin was found : But what does Christ say ? Why I say unto you Swear not at all ; neither by Heaven, nor by Earth, or Jerusalem, or the Head. Directly contrary to swearing by the Temple, the Altar, the Heavens, which the Pharisees taught to be Lawful to do, and not be bound by such kind of Oaths. Which in my opinion is very Weak and Gross ; for if it be plain, as it is, that Christ forbad such Oaths as men ought not to break, but to perform to the Lord, then it was not such Oaths as the Pharisees taught to be Lawful to take, and not be bound by them when they had done. So that he forbids such Oaths as he says the Pharisees Doctrin was found in ; because it was what they ought not to break, but perform to the Lord : So that Christ was so far from limiting his Prohibition to the Pharisees Oaths, by Heaven, Earth, Jerusalem, or the Head ; which this Man says they made not obligatory, that he forbids them, by forbidding those Oaths, that according to the Ancient Doctrin of the

the Jewish-Law, Men ought not to breack but perform to the Lord, that as every Major includes its Minor, so Christ by his prohibition of the use of Lawful Oaths, includes the prohibition of the practice of Unlawful Oaths.

Page 67. His fifth Allegation is every whit as much beside the matter as what he said before, *viz.* *That Christ did not condemn swearing by Jerusalem, the Throne, the Foot-Stool, &c. Holily, but as Vainly and Unholily ased*: Which is to exceed the Bounds of all other Writers; so very heartily does this Man love Swearing. But now I must tell him, that he has much wrested the Text, and perverted the plain and obvious sense of it, and misrepresented the Mind and Doctrin of the Lord Jesus Christ; for it is evident, to every considerate Reader, that Christ in that Chapter was not reproving what was Reproveable under the Law; nor was he exhorting his Auditors and Disciples to live up to the Righteousness of it, which was the way of the Prophets, that were under that Dispensation; but

Christ

Chr
ven
Rig
that
the
as o
33,
them
I say
his L
ger o
say t
Te h
old t
but I
upon
comm
heart
been
swear
to the
at all
Proh
and,
word
Gosp

Christ plainly introduces a *new one*; even the Dispensation of the Gospel, the Righteousness of his Kingdom, and that is the difference between them, as in the Case of *Killing, Adultery &c.* As well as of swearing, *Mat. 5. 21, 22, 27, 28, 33, 34.* *Ye have heard that it was said to them of Old time thou shalt not Kill; but I say unto you, that whosoever is Angry with his Brother without a Cause, shall be in danger of the Judgment; Yea, whosoever shall say thou Fool, shall be in danger of Hell-Fire. Ye have heard that it was said, by them of old time; thou shalt not commit Adultery; but I say unto you, that whosoever looketh upon a Woman to Lust after her, hath committed Adultery with her already in his heart. Again, Ye have heard that it hath been said of Old time, Thou shalt not forswear thy self, but shalt perform thy Oaths to the Lord; but I say unto you swear not at all.* Now I would fain know if Christ's Prohibition goes no farther than *Moses's*; and, if he does not intend by these words, that the Righteousness of the Gospel should exceed that of the Law: The
Parallel

Parallel runs thus ; *Thou shalt not Kill, thou shalt not commit Adultery*, says Moses. *Thou shalt not be Angry, thou shalt not Lust*, says Christ. Now this was no false Gloss of the *Pharisees* in that time, which Christ reprehended or reformed, as this Adversary would suppose ; but a plain improvement upon the Rightousness of the Law, viz. *Thou shalt not Forswear thy self, but shalt perform to the Lord thine Oaths*, says Moses. But I say unto you, *swear not at all*, says Christ ; neither by Heaven, for it is Gods Throne ; nor by the Earth, for it is his Foot-stool ; neither by Jerusalem, nor thy Head, but let your Communication be Yea, yea ; Nay, nay ; for whatsoever is more than these, someth of evil. Upon which even Beza says, that by forswearing, *We are not to understand a false Oath, but that it is best not to swear at all*. And that what Speech is of an higher nature than this, is too much and cometh of evil ; and Tremelius, out of Maimonides says, *He is the best Man that will upon no account swear*. And the Annotation upon this place, of a Translation,

Anno,

Ann
voul
deny
that
be fi
own
abou
Grea
a ba
Spee
and
Evil
Apo
But
neith
other
else ;
Tea ;
denn
O
ly ev
so e
King
self r
of hi
is it c

Kill,
oses:
Lust,
false
hich
this
plain
s of
swear
hine
you,
r by
y the
er by
Com-
for
evil.
for-
false
all.
na-
eth
ides
upon
ati-
on,
nno,

Anno. 1599 says, *Whatever yea vouch,*
vouch it barely, and whatsoever yea deny,
deny it barely, without any more Words;
 that is, let your affirming and denying
 be simple and upon the Authority of your
 own Word and Truth, without going
 about to find it by the Authority of a
 Greater and Holier thing, which is not
 a bare and simple, but a compounded
 Speech, and so more than Yea, yea;
 and Nay, Nay; and therefore cometh of
 Evil. To which that Passage of the
 Apostle James aptly refers. *Jam. 5. 12.*
But above all things my Brethren swear not,
neither by Heaven, nor by Earth, nor by any
other Oath; which is to say, as by nothing
else; so not by God: But let your Yea, be
Yea; and Nay, nay; Lest ye fall into con-
demnation.

One would think this Man had hard-
 ly ever read the Bible, to make Oaths
 so essential a part of the Religion and
 Kingdom of Christ; when Christ him-
 self makes it a part of the Righteousness
 of his Kingdom, *not to swear at all.* Or
 is it candid in him to limit Christ's prohi-
 bition

bition to the then false Glosses of the *Pharisees*, when Christ looks over their Heads, back to the very *Decalogue* or *Ten Commandments*, for an instance, to shew, *by comparison*, how much the Righteousness of his Kingdom excels that of the Law, that came by *Moses*. I could wish there was no thing but weakness to be charged upon this Man in this particular; but his Abilities look too considerable else where for that, as well as his Disengenuity too frequent; not to conclude it of a *meditated Temperament* to force the Text, rather than not have his ends upon us: But with what success he has managed it, We must leave to the Judicious Reader.

Abraham Kenner
Book of Sunbury 911 id
Jan^y 19 - 1754

His

*His Appendix about Baptism
and the Lords Supper (so
called) Considered; and the
Key, which the People called
Quakers, defended against
his Exceptions in those two
Particulars.*

OF Baptism he writes thus. *Bap-
tism is a Rite of Admission into the
Family of God, making Persons Citizens
of Heaven, and free of the Kingdom of the
Messias. It consists of an outward and visi-
ble sign, and an inward spiritual Grace.
These are the two parts of the same Baptism,
but not two Baptisms.*

One would think that this Man had
never read the third of Matt. or the first
of

of the *Acts*. For in the first *John*, distinguishes his Baptism from Christ's as plainly as he does his Person (*viz.*) *I indeed Baptize you with Water to Repentance: But he that cometh after me is mightier then I, whose Shoes I am not worthy to bear: He shall Baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with Fire: Which shews their difference in Nature, Excellency and Efficacy. In the last Scripture Christ himself, just before his parting with his Disciples, does very expressly and Emphatically distinguish betwixt his own Baptism and the Baptism of John. For says he, John truly Baptized with Water, but ye shall be Baptized with the Holy Ghost not many Days hence. I shall not insist upon the force of this place and Context now so fully, as by and by, yet nothing can well be plainer, than that Christs words imply two Baptisms, that's the Water was John's; and the Holy Ghost His: And that his intention was to leave that distinction upon the minds of his Disciples; not only that John's and his were two Baptisms but that Water was John's*

John
all
Pag
beli
not
he
ble
Bap
App
App
Aga
Par
Mon
whe
holy
alon
Disc
His
bid
it, v
was
the f
And
had
with
toget

John's and not his. And this too after all is granted by our Opposer himself Page 89. where he says, *Can any Man believe that Jesus used John's Baptism, and not his own, in making of Disciples?* But he adds Page 78. *For neither is the visible part alone, or the invisible by it self, Baptism; but both in union by the Divine Appointment:* But where this Divine Appointment is, he does not tell us. Again, Page 87. *John did the outward Part, and Jesus the inward Part the same Moment.* But surely he is mistaken, when John tells us the Baptism of the holy Ghost was to come after, not to go along with his: And Christ told his Disciples that it was to come, (so that His and John's went not together) And bid them *stay at Jerusalem till they received it, viz. The Promise of the Father, which was the pouring forth of the holy Ghost;* As the first chapter of the *Acts* informs us: And that was nigh three Years after they had been Baptized, and Baptized others with Water: So that both did not go together, as this Man Dreams. But

H

he

he proceeds, Page 80. For John admitted Men into the Faith of the Messiah; That is, into the State of Subjects, owing and acknowledging Allegiance to Christ. And Christ owns this Grant and Admission valid in his Kingdom, and that they were legally instated in the rights of his Kingdom, whom John Baptized: This being done by a publick Authorized Herald of his Kingdom.

But it's strang that John had the power to admit Men into the Faith of Him, when at first he sent his Disciples to him to know if he were the Messiah, or they were to look for another. This is to give John the Keys of David, and to make Regeneration an absolute and necessary Adjunct or Concomitant of his Water Baptism. But those Baptized by John's Baptism were so far from being admitted into the State of Subjects, and enjoying the Rights of Christ's Kingdom, that in Acts 18. Apollas is said to know ~~only~~ John's Baptism: And chap. 19. Certain Disciples to John's Baptism, declared to Paul they had not so much as heard

if

(11)
if there were any such thing as the holy
Ghost : So that when Paul askt them,
To whom then were you Baptized, they an-
swered, To John's Baptism, by way of
distinction from Christ's. And the Apo-
stles Question led them to that Answer,
being founded upon a distinction be-
tween the Baptism of John, and that of
Christ. And lastly, I must take leave to
wonder how he can think to word, up-
on us so great an untruth. As that of
Christ's owning an admission into his King-
dom by John's Baptism, and that such are
legally instated in the Rights thereof, be-
cause they were Baptized of John, when
Christ himself says, That the least in the
Kingdom of God, is greater then John ;
which implys that John himself was not
of that Kingdom : And because that can-
not be understood of the Person or Soul
of John, for so he was certainly a glorious
Subject of it, it must refer to his Ad-
ministration, which, He himself tells us
also must decrease, and Christ's in-
crease. Besides, Christ told Nicodemus,
that unless a Man be born again he cannot

H 2

see

see the Kingdom of God; How then is he a Subject, and invested in the Rights of that Kingdom? Again, did John's Baptism Regenerate? If it did, What need of Fire and Holy Ghost that John said was to come after? What need of any thing after John's, if it was so effectual, or was he always attended with such a Power as is affirmed? Where now is our Adversaries haughty assertion, That John's Disciples, as such, were the Subjects of Christ's Kingdom, and Legally invested in the Rights thereof, when it is plain that the least of that Kingdom is greater than their very Baptizer, the Great Herald of the Kingdom? But that Expression it self gives away the Cause, being well considered; For the Forerunner ends in Him, He Foreruns, and the Herald in the Presence of his King. He has forgotten, who it was that said, or that it was ever said, The Prophets lasted till John, and he ended them, but he did not begin the Christian Dispensation; that was Christ's work. John's Baptism left men in that Old World of Jewish Rites,

Rites
Chr
He
Inh
E
that
part
not
Kin
Rig
wit
said
the
fulf
the
Chr
Chr
of
to i
Chr
Pro
ma
wh
its
ow
Rig

Rites, where it found them; but tis Christ's that makes all things new; *new Heavens, new Earth* and *new Creatures* to Inherit them.

But says this Author, *Christ declares, that being Baptized with Water, was a part of Righteousness*; Which it could not be, unless there was a Law of the Kingdom for it. As if it might not be Righteousness without such a Law; For with his favour there is as much to be said for Christ's *Circumcision* and eating the *Pascal Lamb*, &c. Since that was to fulfil all Righteousness too; and yet there was no Law of the Kingdom of Christ for them, unless this be one, that Christ was to fulfil the Righteousness of the Law, which he did in General, to introduce the Kingdom of God. For Christ's fulfilling of the Law and the Prophets, of which *John* was the *Last*, made way for the Kingdom to come, which was not of this World, nor are its Rights, by consequence; but of its own nature. That Christ did fulfil all Righteousness in condescending and con-

forming to divers Rites, is so far from ratifying or confirming the Practice of them, as this Man suggests, that it Discharges and Abolishes them. This appears very plain in that Christ's performing of the Rites of the Law was in order to end them, *being made under the Law for that very purpose.* So that his being Baptized by John does not Establish, or any more confirm that Baptism, than his being Circumcised after Moses does perpetuate Circumcision. On the contrary it rather ends John's Baptism. Moses and the Prophets were till John, and John was till Christ; both had their times, and both their Periods in him.

I am not he, says John; but John's Baptism is It, says this Opponent, which is to put John's Baptism in the room of Christ's; and John's Ministry, tho' not his Person, in lieu of Christ's. Now Moses and the Prophets were as the Stars of the Night; John as the Morning Star, the Forerunner of Day. He rose last, but shined most: But tho' the Morning Star be the most burning and shining of all the

the celestial Lights; and next to the Rising of the Sun himself; yet his time is shortest, his Light is soon swallowed up of the Sun.

Page 81. But this Man tells us, *That Christ gave Commission to his Disciples to Baptize with Water, Matt. 28. 19. And that they did understand it so by their Practice.* But is it practicable or possible that any Scripture can reasonably be said to declare an Institution, or be the Commission of any thing which it does not express? Now in that Text there is not a word of Water, how then is Water Baptism instituted by it? I cannot help wondering, and this Man must allow it me, that the only Text to prove the Commission of so Celebrated a practice in our times, should not declare a Word of it. But I shall next shew, notwithstanding he reproduces following Practice, to prove Christ meant and his Disciples understood it so, that the Text means it no more then it Expresses it; and that Christ, that gave that Commission never intended it to refer to Water. This is

the Text, *Go ye, Teach all Nations, Baptizing them in the name of the Father, the Son and holy Ghost.* Mat. 28. 19. Now Christ by this Commission must mean his own Baptism of the Spirit, and that from the nature and force of the Words, as well as comparison of them, with other places to which they relate, and that are also lately Explanatory of them. The words are not *in* the Name, but *into* the Name of the Father, &c. Which must refer to the Power and Spirit of Christ; Water being too feeble to *change and wash a Heart*, which is the import of Baptizing into the Name or Nature of the Father, Son and holy Ghost: That is, by the Ministry which is from the Spirit. So *Mark* 16. Where Christ saith *They shall cast out Devils in my Name*; that is, by my power, or by the virtue or force of Spirit, which shall attend you for that work and service, that many may be turned from the evil of their way and made Heirs of an endless Kingdom.

In

In fine, after you have received the Spirit, you shall Teach and Baptize, or Dip, Plunge, and Interest them that believe, into the Name and Power of God, unto Holiness, Righteousness, Mercy, Truth &c. Qualifying them to bear the holy and excellent name of Father, Son and holy Ghost.

And that this is not strained, but natural, and no *Allegory* upon the Text, I shall desire my *Reader* to look forward, to the First of the *Acts*, and the First nine verses ; which plainly expounds this Commission, and consequently resolves us what Baptism it refers to ; particularly the 4th, 5th, 8th, 9th, Verses, viz. *And being assembled together with them, commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, which, saith he, ye have heard of me. For John truly Baptized with Water ; but ye shall be Baptized with the holy Ghost, not many Days hence. But ye shall receive power after that the holy Ghost is come upon you : And ye shall be witnesses, unto me, both in Jerusalem, and in all Ju-*
dea

dea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the Earth. And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up, and a cloud received him out of their sight.

In which three things are observable. First that Christ Distinguishes his Baptism from John's. Secondly, That he assigns Water to John's, and the holy Ghost to his own Baptism. Not that John and he had two Water Baptisms, yet two Baptisms, but that John's was the Water Baptism, and his the Baptism of the holy Ghost. Therefore his is not a Water Baptism, but a Baptism contradistinguished from that of Water, as much as the Person of John was from the Person of Christ.

Thirdly, by comparing the 28th of Mat. with this place in the Acts, we may see that the Commission in one, is to be construed by the qualification in the other, which is not exprest at all in Mat. 28. There they are bid to Go; here they are bid to Stay; that is, Stay before you go, and have your Qualifications before you

you Qualify ; viz. The Promise of the Fa-
ther, to wit, the Baptism of the holy
Ghost ; that is to say, Power from on
High. Why, had they been Preaching
 2 or 3 Years, and been Baptized and
 Baptizing with Water, that this Man
 lays is followed, *that Moment*, with the
 Baptism of the holy Ghost, and yet had
 not been themselves Baptized with it,
 nor as yet received Power from on High
 to *Disciple and Baptize* any into Christ's
 Kingdom, with Christ's Baptism ? This
 must be strange to our Opponent, and
 who can help it ? But so it is, Reader.
 For that as one *Evangelist*, and part of
 Scripture, supplies and explains another,
 this in the *Acts* shews, that the Com-
 mission in *Matt.* supposes the Qualificati-
 on, mentioned in the First of the *Acts*,
 to preceed it ; else they were to go, be-
 fore they were Qualified to Perform.
 If then it is rational to suppose, that what
 past at Christ's Farewel, as reherst by
 the Evangelist, should be all laid toge-
 ther, for our more plain and compleat
 understanding of the import of it, we
 must

must in ours, conclude, that the Disciples were to stay at *Jerusalem*, till they had received the *Promise of the Father*; that is, till they were *Baptized with the holy Ghost*; and then the Commission took place, for them to *Go and Teach all Nations, Baptizing them in the Name of the Father Son and Holy Ghost*. Now then, if in order of time, and from the nature of the Discourse, it must be so, how is the Baptism in *Mat.* a *Water Baptism*? *John* truly *Baptized with Water*, but ye shall be *Baptized with the Holy Ghost not many Days hence*: Then *Go ye, Teach all Nations Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, &c.* It is plain, this is the true Order of the Discourse; not only from what I have already said, as to Qualification, *preceeding* Commission, (for they need no such to Baptize with Water, having done that 2 or 3 Years before, without it) But for that Baptizing stands alone in *Mat.* 28:19. Which would have been Ambiguous, had not that passage in *Acts* 1. 5. preceeded, which made it needless to tell us what

fort

sort of Baptism they were to Baptize
 with, and what they were not, For
 John truly Baptized with Water, but ye shall
 be Baptized with the Holy Ghost not many
 Days hence : Therefore not with John's
 Baptism any more, but with the Bap-
 tism of the Spirit, do you go Teach all
 Nations, Baptizing them through the Holy
 Spirit ; into the Name of the Father, of
 the Son and Holy Ghost ; Make them
 true Jews, true Israelites, in whom there
 is no guile. And tis certain it was a
 new Scene and Part they had to Act ; as
 much Superior to what was before, as
 Form is to Power, Letter to Spirit, Sha-
 dow, to Substance. Greater things than
 these shall ye do, said our Blessed Lord,
 because I go to my Father. I think I have
 not strained the Text, or extorted a
 wrong meaning. I write what I believe,
 and take to be the genuine sense of the
 place, without partiality, or passion.
 But our Adversary will have it, that the
 Apostles used Water Baptism, in persua-
 sance of this Commission, and instances
 the Words of Peter in the case of Corne-
 lius,

him, for proof thereof. The words are these, Can any Man forbid Water; that these should not be Baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost, as well as we? Upon which, says our Opponent p. 82. If it had not been an Ordinance, any one might have forbid it, therefore the Apostles accounted themselves obliged by God to do so; and that it was not in their Power to refuse it, unless they would resist God. To which I say, as before. First that Water Baptism was John's, and not Christ's. Secondly, That Practice is no Institution. Thirdly, That the Apostle Peter did but continue a Practice, introduced by John, not easily left among a Ceremonious People, it having obtained Reputation among them, and was the Discriminating Sign or Mark of a change of Dispensation at hand; and this Peter could not but know, after those Distinguishing and Emphatical Words of his Lord and Master, Acts 1st. But the Disciples having before been actually engaged in the practice of John's Baptism, in order to call People to the expectation of

of a
war
Chr
as w
Disp
who
serva
dom
whic
out)
there
his m
The
Man
the
Wate
about
fear h
to th
the G
our T
to Re
ter hi
yet la
Comli
as m

of a further thing, continued it afterwards; not of Authority, but in their Christian Liberty and Condescension, as what had a Reference to the Christian Dispensation; in as much as *John*, to whose Ministry it was the peculiar observation, (which Christ tells the Kingdom (that *John* said was at hand, and which Christ came to set up) was without) Concluded the Prophets, and became therein the *Fore-runner* of Christ, and his more excellent Dispensation. Lastly, The Reason of *Peter's* Words, *Can any Man forbid Water &c.* referred not to the Institution, Authority or Force of Water Baptism, but to *Peter's* Caution about *Cornelius*, that was a *Gentile* for fear he should give any publick distast to the *Jews*, whose prejudices against the *Gentiles*, like some *Predestinarians* of our Times, excluded them any pretence to Religion; insomuch that we see *Peter* himself, without a Vision, was not yet large enough in his Spirit, to credit *Comeliness*, Convictions and Devotion; as much as if he had said, *Why may not*

not this Man, though a Gentile, be Baptized with Water, since he has received the Holy Ghost, which is the requisite Qualification of a True Christian; and that the promise of the Father is to them that are a far off, even to all that the Lord our God shall call, as well as to the Seed of Abraham, after the Flesh. So that the Reason of Peter's using those words, was not to give Authority to Water Baptism; as an Ordinance of Christs Kingdom, but to excuse himself against Jewish exceptions, that he feared would be scandalized at his owning of a Gentile, that, to them, was Unclean, Prophane and Reprobate.

His other Scripture in defence of what he asserts, is Acts 9. 18. which says, That Paul received his sight, and was Baptized by Ananias. But not a word of Water, is in the Text, or the foregoing or following Verses. On the contrary there is reason to believe it was not meant. And Ananias putting his hands on him, said, Brother Saul, the Lord (even Jesus that appeared unto thee

in

in
th
fill
ly
fca
an
is,
to
No
tiz
tifi
wi
tiz
sam
Co
thi
tho
stia
I b
ther
men
he
ter
ly
ther

in the way as thou camest) hath sent me, that thou mayest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost; and immediately there fell from his eyes, as it had been scales, and he received his sight forthwith, and arose and was baptized. Now here is, first, Sight and Holy Ghost to be given to Saul, by the Ministry of Ananias: Next, he received Sight, and was Baptized. Now must not this be the Baptism of the Holy Ghost, since being fill'd with the Holy Ghost, and being Baptized, are, by the Text made one and the same thing? Especially since it is past all Controversie, that there was such a thing as the Baptism of the Holy Ghost.

His other Scripture, to prove the Authority of Water-Baptism, among Christians, is, Acts II. 15, 16, 17. And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them, as on us at the beginning. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with Water, but you shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost. Forasmuch then as God gave them the like Gift as he did unto us, who
I *believed*

believed on the Lord Jesus Christ, what was I that I could resist God?

Which is so far from weakening, that it confirms our Sense and Assertion: For the bent of Peter's Words is to justify himself, in going to, and communing with the *Uncircumcision*, and not to vindicate Water-Baptism. And that which he offer'd in his own Vindication to his Brethren, was, 1. His Vision. 2. *Cornelius's* Righteousness and Devotion. And, 3. God's owning of him, in that the Holy Ghost fell upon him as it had upon them at the Beginning. Forasmuch then, says Peter, as God gave them the like Gift, what was I that I could withstand God? As if he had said, How could I refuse to own them, and have Fellowship with them that God own'd and had Fellowship with, and Gifted and Sanctified, as well as the believing Jews? speaking not one Word in his Account to the Brethren, of *Water-Baptism*: But, on the contrary, he makes it *John's*, by way of Distinction from Christ's Baptism, by remembering and repeating the

the Words of his Lord and Master, *said*.
John indeed baptized with Water, but ye
shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost. I
 appeal to every indifferent Reader, if I
 have not done Justice to the Text.

I shall next consider his *Exceptions* to
 what I say in my *Key*, in defence of our
Disuse or *Cessation* of *Water-Bap-*
tism, &c.

Page 83, 84. The first Reason he
 makes me give for it, is, *That all Pro-*
testants are against Figures and Shadows:
 To which he answers, *But Baptism and*
the Lord's Supper being no Figures nor Sha-
dows, all Protestants are for them; unless
the Quakers are to be accounted Protestants,
that disown all Protestant Churches, and
are own'd by none. This is all he quotes
 of mine, and this is what he says, on
 what he has quoted: So that they may
 be of the Nature of *Shadows* and *Figures*
 for all him; and consequently that *Pro-*
testants practise against Judgment. For
 he only denies them to be *Figures* and
Shadows, and leaves us there. But he
 had done well if he had given us his

Reasons, and had also taken Notice of what I say, page 22. in my *Key*, which immediately foregoes what he has cited out of it; *viz. That Practice only, is no Institution*; and that is all he can allege in favour of *John's Baptism*. That which seems my part to perform, tho' he presses not upon me, is to shew, that *Water-Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper* (so called) are of the *Nature of Figures and Shadows*, of which Christ was the Substance.

Now, that they are so, we must consider, That if Christ was the end of *John*, as *John* renders him, *Matth. 3. 11. John 3. 30.* and Christ himself suggests to us, *Matth. 11. 7 to 12.* Then *Water-Baptism* was but a *Forerunner*, and shewed forth what was to come, that which the *least in the Kingdom of Heaven exceeded*, and therefore not of the Kingdom, and consequently of no longer Force in Point of Institution. Tho' by being the *Observation*, peculiar to *John's Ministry*, it had obtained Credit, and therefore was continued, *ex gratia*. But
it

it is plain from Christ's own Words, *The Kingdom of God came not with Observation*, Luke 17. 20. At least therefore *Protestants* ought to be modest upon us, with respect to the Reason we render for our *Cessation* of Water-Baptism. And tho' he says, *We ought not to be accounted Protestants, that disown all Protestant Churches, and are owned by none of them*: I would have this Author to know, We are *True Protestants*: *Protestants* upon those Reasons, that were the *first Motives* to that Character; and can compare, in our *Negatives*, with any Species of *Protestants*. And do challenge this Author, without Vanity, upon that Head, begin when he will.

At the same time, we cannot but have Charity for the Persons of *Roman Catholicks*, and would by that teach them the Truth and greater Excellency of our Religion.

And next, for our *disowning* of all other Protestant Churches, and *not being owned* by them; first it is not upon the same Grounds that the *Roman Catho-*

licks disown them. And, secondly, Experience tells us, It is what all sorts of Protestants do to one another; and therefore not so singular in us, as is suggested by this ill-willing Author.

But, he is mightily displeased with me, For being against all Figures in the Time of the Gospel; adding, That we Mortals cannot think, or speak, or work without Figures; distinguishing between *preannunciative* and *commemorative* Signs: Ridiculing me for such an Assertion. But if my Reader will turn to Page 24. of my Key, cited by this Author, He will find I only deny, under the Gospel, the Necessity and Service of *preannunciative* or *forerunning* Signs: Joyning to Signs, Figures and Shadows; and promiscuously using them to one and the same Purpose; and therefore not all Signs, but Signs of something to come, and to be accomplish'd by the coming thereof: As the following Words, he makes another Quibble upon, plainly shew, *viz.* That the Nature of the Gospel is Inward, Spiritual and Eternal. But he leaves

leaves out, *That therefore the continuing to practise Figures, Signs and Shadows, as still in force, which forerun Christ and his Dispensation, make his Coming of none effect.* For then he had given too strong a Reason for our Disuse, and disappointed himself of the unfair Advantage he endeavours to gain upon me, by letting his Reader see that I did not deny the Continuance of all Signs, but *pronunciative or foretelling* ones: Such as are of the Nature of *Figures and Shadows*, and therefore can have no Commission to perpetuate them; of which I take *Water Baptism* and the *Supper* to be two. For Christ, as well as *John*, declares *Water-Baptism* a *Forerunner* of a more excellent Baptism. And one thing wherein that Excellency of Christ's Baptism consists, is the durableness of it: But if *John's* is to last as long as Christ's, Christ's does not excel *John's* in Duration; quite contrary to *John's* own Discrimination and Testimony, *viz. He (Christ) shall increase and I decrease.* But if it be considered, That this Adver-

fary would make me deny all Signs, as *Exodus 7. 8. 9. Numb. 11. Psal. 77. Jer. 32.* Just as his Friend *J. Faldo*, and some of that Ingenuity, have made us to deny all Scripture Commands, because some of us have said, in *Temporary* and *Extraordinary* Cases (as that of *Jeremiah, Jonas, Amos, &c.*) "That which is a Command to another is no Command to us, unless the same Spirit require the same, or the like thing of us; therefore the Moral Law or Decalogue is no Law or Command to us, nor are we obliged to yield Obedience to it, tho it be general and perpetual. I say, they that consider the Justice of my Parallel, and Injustice of his Insinuation, will perceive he is not a fair Enemy, nor ought to have Credit with his Reader, to our Prejudice.

I am then no more against *Figures* than against *Forms*. We cannot, I know; live, speak or act without them: But these are not forerunning Signs or Forms, *Temporary* and *Shadowy Observations*: But such necessary and essential ones, as are
coupl'd

coupl'd
Con
B
me,
Spir
with
and
the I
venu
Will
and
Thi
har
ple's
is a
for
Infi
rem
Tha
and
ing
Ne
days
with
of
that

coupl'd to our very Being, and requisite
Converse among Men.

But, from this he falls hard upon
me, because I say the Gospel is *Inward*,
Spiritual, and *Eternal*: For, says he,
without many Figures, this is not Sense,
and with them, is either not true or not to
the Purpose. The Gospel being the new Co-
venant, is neither *Inward* nor *Outward*.
Will W. P. never leave talking of *Inside*
and *Outside*, of things that have no Sides?
This Language, I doubt not, will sound
harsh, as well as light, to other Peo-
ple's Ears, as well as ours: And truly he
is a daring and an adventurous Person,
for till now I thought Truth had an
Inside: If he had read the 31st of Je-
remiah, he would have found there,
That the Gospel is an inward State,
and has an Inside; where God, speak-
ing by that Prophet of the Gospel, or
New Covenant Time, says, *Behold the*
days come that I will make a new covenant
with the house of Israel, and with the house
of Judah: Not according to the covenant
that I made with their fathers in the day
that

that I took them by the hand, to bring them out of the land of Egypt. (which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord) But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel, After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my Law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts, and will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: For they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord: For I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more. Now here is Truth with its both Sides: Truth in its outward Apperance, according to the low and carnal State of Man: And this may be called, comparatively, the *Outside of Truth*. Here also we may learn, That Truth has an *Inside*; a more Spiritual and Eternal Part; and that is what I call the *Gospel Dispensation*: Or that this more Inward and Spiritual Apperance of the Truth, is the *New Covenant*

nan
Jesu
dom
God
SIN,
the
the
that
if th
and
Wh
with
chris
Be
partly
it ma
Con
wife,
Nor
the C
It;
Cove
servat
such;
dom of

nant or Gospel. What else did our Lord Jesus intend by the *Gospel of the Kingdom*, than the Blessing of the Power of God, to deliver Man from the Power of Sin, and Satan the Original of it? So the Apostle phrases it; *The Gospel is the Power of God to Salvation*. That is, the Power of the Kingdom of God; and that is the Gospel of the Kingdom. Now if this be not of an *Inward, Spiritual* and *Eternal* Nature, nothing can be: Which, I presume, the Reader will, with me, think an absurd as well as unchristian Expression.

But he says, It is *partly Inward and partly Outward*. I say it is Inward, but it may be Outwardly express'd by a godly Conversation; and so far, and no otherwise, it may be said to be Outward. Nor does this weaken my Assertion, or the Consequence I have observed from it; viz. That the Gospel and New Covenant, came not with *Outward Observations*; and that *Water-Baptism* was such; Therefore no Ordinance of the Kingdom of the Messiah.

But

But if it be an Ordinance, as this Author says, p. 87. and that the Inward Part *keeps Time* with the Outward (for there he allows of *Inside* and *Outside*) then it would do so to as many as have the Outward Part administered to them: But we have no Evidence of such Concurrence of the Holy Ghost. We have never found it in our selves, nor do we see it in others, that are in the Practice of it, but much the contrary; in that *Envy, Pride, Luxury* and *Covetousness* prevail, and Little of the true Cross of Christ, Self-Denial, Dying dayly, or the New Creature appears: How then does the Inward Grace make up but one Baptism, if it accompany not Water? But of that I have already treated before; and, it is plain, 'tis but *Gratis Dictum* on our Adversaries Side. He begs the Question.

Lastly, p. 90. finding himself a-ground about that Passage of the Apostle Paul, 1 Cor. 1. 7. *For Christ sent me not to Baptize but to Preach the Gospel.* He endeavours to gloss away its Force, what he

he c
and
he c
was
whi
tion
to b
were
the
I
on i
is n
that
Chr
Bap
nist
stir
pre
plis
Gh
Ad
E
sis,
sent
citi
he

he can from the End for which I cited it, and the Apostle writ it. The first thing he opposes is, *That since Water-Baptism was Peter's and his Brethren's Commission, which Christ gave them before the Ascension, to the End of the World—It is not to be imagined that Matthias and Paul were without it.* But in this also he begs the Question.

I have already shew'd that Commission is mistaken by him, and that Water is no ways concern'd in that Text; and that Water-Baptism was *John's* and not *Christ's*; and that they were not one Baptism, or inseparable in their Administration. Also, that Practice is *no institution*, and that Water-Baptism is a *prenunciative* Sign, and has its Accomplishment in that Baptism of the Holy Ghost, as *John* had in *Christ*; the two Administrators of the two Baptisms.

But next, he says, Paul spoke an *Ellipsis*, elegantly; meaning, *That he was not sent only to Baptize, but chiefly to Preach*; citing Two or Three Scriptures, that he imagines Parallel, and Illustrate that

that Place, as *Hos. 6. 6.* *I will have mercy and not sacrifice.* And, *let women adorn themselves, not with putting on of apparel, &c.* *1 Pet. 3. 34.* Now, I say he, *These Places prove, that the Israelites were not to sacrifice to God, and Women must go naked, &c.* (as some Quakers did) with the same Evidence that Paul's Words teach, *That Christ sent not him to Baptize.* He might, if he had pleased, have cut it all short, and like what *L. Muggleton* once said of *Moses*, have told us, *Paul did not mean what he writ.* But these Places are ill apply'd by this Man, for when God said, *He would have Mercy and not Sacrifice;* he meant not to have Sacrifice at that Time, and in those Cases, wherein he called for Mercy: He would not be so put off, nor have Duties exchanged. That Speech is limited to, and to be interpreted by the present State of the People he spoke to, who were unqualified for Sacrifice, because they were unmerciful and cruel, and the merciful God in that State would have none of their Sacrifices. What is this

this
tism
mish
Case
again
App
fle
as th
viz.
and n
So
said i
part
Chri
Fo
Wom
with
few c
a Sig
Man
Lond
some
partic
that
havin
their
this

this to the Apostles Words about Baptism, that denies it any part in his Commission? There is no parallel in the Case, but if any, it is for us rather than against us. For that of not putting on of Apparel, 'tis evident, that the Apostle intended by *ἡμετέρας ἱματίων ἀνδρῶν*, as the Words themselves plainly import, viz. Garments of *Finery* and *Ornament*, and not useful Cloathing.

So that the Apostle meant what he said in the use of the Word, for such Apparel is not to be ever used by true Christians.

For his saying, That some of our Women have gone naked; 'tis affirmed with Lightness and Untruth; tho' some few of our Friends have gone naked, for a *Sign* to this Generation, as the poor Man in it that prophesied of the *Fire of London*, and another, of God's *stripping* some Persecutors of their Power, and in particular, that Generation of the Clergy that preceded the Restoration, which having Rise through Persecution, forgot their Pleas, when they had Power, towards

wards those that dissented from them, and testified against the same evils in them; that they had justly inveighed against in the former Bishop's Days. And now he may see we are not against all S I G N S.

To conclude, It is plain, the Apostle had no Obligation upon him to this Expression, from a Comparison any had made between Water-Baptism and the Preaching of the Gospel. Nor does he use any, tho' this Man makes him to do so, to justify his imagined Elegancy. The occasion of this Expression, the Text shews, was the Vanity of some Disciples, that were comparing and boasting of their *Baptizers*; not a Word of Baptism it self, to over or undervalue that Tradition. Why then does *Paul* take occasion, not only to knock them, but *Baptism* too? What had Baptism done to be so courselly treated? So Sacred an Institution; the very Rite or Door of Admission (says this Man) into the Kingdom of the *Messiah*, p. 80. Why, without doubt, it was to let them see,

see, that they had so little cause to boast of their respective Baptizers (*for who is Paul, and who is Apollos*) that they ought not to value themselves upon that very Baptism, since it was not what he had in Commission, but what he had used as a Tradition, that had obtained some Credit among them: Else the Apostle must not have had the same Commission that the other Apostles had, who yet said, he was behind none of the rest of the Apostles.

Again, Baptizing, in *Matth. 28. 19.* was as much the Apostle's Commission as Teaching or Preaching: Nay, the preferable Part. For tho' Preaching open'd their Understandings, it was Baptism that gave them *Admission into the Kingdom of the Messiah*; made them Subjects thereof; and instated them in the Rights of it: Yea, the Seal of the Covenant that God made by Christ with Mankind, without which no Remission of Sins, or entring of God's Kingdom. Can such a Baptism, (and such an one this Adversary renders Wa-

ter Baptism) be no essential part of Paul's Commission, or not upon equal Terms with Teaching, when by it People are to be interested in the Sacred Name of Father, Son and Holy Ghost? that is, to be made, qualified, admitted and sealed True Christians, Subjects of Christ's Kingdom, Citizens of Heaven, and endowed with all the Privileges thereof. How little is this Man willing to allow Baptism to be, that he may keep it any thing in Force, and excuse it from the genuine Sense of the Apostle's Words? Were there so much Difference between Preaching and Baptism, as between Mercy and Sacrifice, it might have helped him better. But in as much as the Apostle denies Water-Baptism to be in his Commission, and that it is certain he had the same Commission the rest had, whatever was his Practice, in condescension, (as in circumcising of Timothy) that Baptism that is intended in Christ's Commission, *Matth. 28.* must be the Baptism of the Holy

Holy Ghost. And this is the less to be doubted, since the same Apostle that denies Water-Baptism any Place in his Commission (which he could never do, *If an Ordinance of Christ, and the Right of Admission into the Kingdom of the Messiah*) makes Baptism an Article in his Epitomy of Christianity; viz. that there is (Eph. 4. 5, 6.) *One Lord, One Faith, One Baptism: One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.* This Baptism being therefore essential, must be that of his Commission, and consequently the Baptism of the Holy Ghost, *Acts 1. 15.*

But, after all, I know not what Right this Man has to argue upon the Head of Water-Baptism against us; since, if I mistake him not, he is of those that make Children the Subjects of that Practice, who cannot believe, nor be taught in order to it; and therefore not within the Scope and Direction of the Text. If it should be said, That Children may be as well Baptized as Circumcized; I say no: For Faith was not so person-

ally requir'd to Circumcision as it is to Baptism; Nor are the Covenants or Kingdoms the same, to which they refer, therefore an improper and unjust Allusion. Upon the whole Matter, we let fall the Baptism of Water, as *John's*, and not *Christ's*; therefore, not in contempt of a Christian Ordinance, the Lord knows, but in Honour of the Christian Dispensation: And the rather, because of the great abuse of it, both Sprinklers and Dippers laying, as we apprehend, a dangerous Stress upon it: As indeed they do upon the Use of the *Lord's Supper*; far beyond Signs, and as if they were the inward Graces themselves: Too often referring thither, rather than to the Obedience of Faith in Christ; and falsely quieting their unequal Minds under Disobedience and Neglect of the Cross of Jesus, with the Performance of these Outward Signs of Inward Graces, the generality of them being but too barren of any true Sign of the Power of Grace upon them. But to that little he has said about the *Lord's Supper*,

Supper, so called, I must say something
before I close this Treatise. He tells
us,

Page 92. *The same in Substance may
be said of the Lord's Supper as of Bap-
tism.*

Repl. Then the same, in Substance,
may serve in Defence of the other.

He adds,

*Christ celebrates it with his Disciples,
signifying, That his Meaning was, they
should perform this Service at other Times,
after his Death, by constraining them to do
it in Remembrance of him, which is a full
Institution of this Service.*

Repl. That which Christ celebrated
was the *Pascal Lamb*, or *Passover*, which
he told his Disciples he so much longed
to eat with them. And this was the
Jews great *Anniversary Supper*, in Com-
memoration of their Fore-Fathers mighty
Deliverance from *Pharaoh*, and pass-

ing at Night out of Egypt, towards the Land that God had promised their Father *Abraham*, he would give to his Offspring. And it was also the Conclusion or winding up of the Course of our Saviours Life, the fulfilling of the shadowy Ordinances and Ministration he was born under (he being the Antitipe); at the close of which he was graciously pleas'd to insinuate to them, that unwelcom and uneasie News of his Departure and Death, by bidding them, eat that Bread, and drink that Cup, and so do the like, as a *Memorial*, or in Remembrance of him, viz. his Death, till he came to them again,

He did hereby,

I. Inform them of his Departure and Death, by giving them a Memorial of him, which was so hard for them to think of.

II. He tells them, That he will not leave them Comfortless, he will come to them again, and he will drink new Wine with them in the Kingdom of his Father, which, in its due Season should be

be made manifest to them.

III. That they were to look to that Coming, as an Accomplishment of that Memorial.

IV. That this must refer to his Spiritual Coming, as the Bread of Life; and that it was only to hold them up in their Minority, whole Weakness, Incredulity and Doubting, were well known to him, and which, *Luke 24. 11, 25.* are enough observ'd; even after all they had heard and seen of the Power of Christ.

That this Practice lasted longer I grant, but that it lasted of Authority, I find not, but rather of Weakness: Signs generally have a Resemblance of the things they signify or represent: There seems none in any other respect to me, so proper and suitable, as of Christ being the *Bread that came down from Heaven*, *Joh. 6:* and as such he came to his Disciples some time after his Ascension, (for as yet they were, as before observ'd, in several respects, Weak, yea, Carnal,

and to be ^{built} up and instructed in
Sacred Mysteries by Outward and Sen-
sible things.

Page 93. As to what this Author says,
That the Apostle Paul had a Commission to
administer this Sacrament, 1 Cor. 11 to
26. It is his Mistake; for it was not a
Commission but a Tradition. He tells
us what he received of the Lord's do-
ings; but neither Commands nor re-
commends it, only reproves Indecency,
and requires more Respect in perform-
ing, *as often as they do it.* But if that
Chapter be well read, the poor and
mean Condition of the People, he writ to,
will be seen, to whom Signs, well un-
derstood, might be of Benefit. But
that neither proves their Continuance
under the New Covenant, nor ther Ser-
vice to those that were come to discern
well the Lord's Body; what it is, and
what it is made of, as Chapter 10. 15,
16, 17.

Page

Page 94, 95. But our Adversary will have it, *That Christ's Coming is to Judgment*, at the End of all things, and till then, this Sacrament, as he calls it, is to continue. Telling me, That when Christ said, he would not drink any more of the Fruit of the Vine, till he should drink it new, with them, in the Kingdom of his Father, Christ indeed means it of a Spiritual Wine, *but that the kingdom of his father was heaven*, and therefore the Sign was not to cease till that Kingdom began, which was not to be, till Christ had delivered up the Kingdom unto God, even his Father, at the End of the World.

Repl. But he has forgot, surely, that in the same page he allows the Kingdom of God was then, among the Jews, tho' not in them, and so come before the end of the World. And if he would have call'd to mind the first Sentence of *John the Baptist's Sermon*, and the Drift of the Disciples Ministry, that Christ sent forth,

forth, he must have found that it was,
*Reptat, for the Kingdom of God, or of
heaven, is at hand, as Matt. 3. 2. ch. 10. 7.*
Then not so far off as the End of the
World. Again, the Apostle declared,
Heb. 12. 22, 23, 24. the true Believers
of his Day were *come to mount Zion,*
God the Judge of all, and to the spirits
of the just made perfect; and also that
they sat in heavenly places in Christ Je-
su, which must be an Attainment above
Signs of invisible Grace; being the
Life and Substance of Religion, and
to the Period and Consummation of
Types, Shadows, and such sort of Signs
or Significations as are in question. They
that personally enjoy their dearest Friends
will not repair to their *Pictures,* tho'
drawn never so much to the Life, to
quicken their Remembrance of them.
Christ did promise his, That he would
come again, he would not leave them com-
fortless, and that he would drink of the
Cup or Fruit of the Vine *after a new, or*
other manner with them, *even in the*
Kingdom of his Father, And in the Re-
vela-

vela
Pro
Bene
and
open
and
Thi
Sup
and
calle
and
True
Supp
whic
be h
most
the
Seed
yet r
grow
the M
Lord
of th
ble V
of th
on hi

revelations, chap. 3. he makes an
Proclamation, as it were with an Angel.
Behold, says he, I stand at the door
and knock; if any man hear my voice and
openeth the door, I will come in to him,
and SUP with him, and he with me.
This, we are not ashamed to say, is our
Supper, or the Supper of the Risen
and Glorified Jesus; which the People
called Quakers do acknowledge, profess
and practice as the Lord's Supper; the
True Gospel, New Covenant-Supper; The
Supper of and in the Kingdom of God;
which is come up in thousands, blessed
be his Name, and is coming more and
more among, and up in the Hearts of
the Children of Men. And tho' the
Seed of this Kingdom be sown in all,
yet the good Ground alone knows it to
grow to Advantage. Those that obey
the Manifestation of the Light of the
Lord Jesus in their Souls, the Seed
of this Kingdom, are the true and sensi-
ble Witnesses of it: The Government
of their Hearts and Affections being up-
on his Shoulders, according to that bless'd
Promise,

Isa. 9. 3, 6, 7. And such as
say, *Thy Kingdom is come, and thy
Will is done, in Earth as it is in Heaven.*
Even so come Lord Jesus, more and more
set up thy Kingdom in the Souls of the
Children of Men; that the Holy Will
of thy Father may be done in Earth,
that Mercy, and Truth, and Righte-
ousness, and Peace may embrace and
kisseach other, so shall the Kingdoms of
this World become the Kingdoms of the
Lord, and of his Christ, who is God
over all, blessed for ever.

Errata, pages 4 and 5, lines last and first,
dele V.

F I N I S.

*A Catalogue of some Books,
Printed for T. Northcott.*

- R**obert Barclay's Works, folio.
G. Fox's Journal, folio.
John Burnyat's Works, quarto.
William Penn's Key, octavo.
—— Fruits of Solitude, twelve.
John Feild's Friendly Advice, twelve.
—— Tompkins's Harmony of the Old
and New Testament, twelve.
—— his Great Duty of Prayer, twelve.
Alexander Pyott's Apology for the Qua-
kers.
—— Whitehead's Christian Doctrine.
J. Feild's Answer to a Catechism against
Quakerism.
John Elliott's Saving Grace of God.
—— his Grace of God asserted.
Ed. Elys's Vindication of William Penn's
Key.
John Feild's Answer to B. Bird.

of the
16th 17th 18th
19th 20th

ERRATA

Page 10, line 6. read *it* be. p. 32. l. 14.
 are. p. 46. l. 9. r. *because we*. p. 52. l. 1.
of God. p. 59. l. 7. r. *alms*. p. 63. l. 1.
shall live. p. 69. l. 2. r. *for*. l. 19. *dele*.
 p. 86. l. ult. r. *de*. p. 87. l. 7. r. *the*.
 p. 90. l. 4. r. *having*. p. 100. l. 1.
 p. 102. l. 11. r. *can*. l. 24. *dele*.
 p. 104. l. 18. r. *falls*. p. 109. l. 7. r. *the*.
 p. 111. l. 14. r. *with*. p. 112. l. 23. r. *the*.
 p. 120. l. 9. r. *also plainly*. l. 21. r. *my Spirit*.
 p. 124. r. *Evangelists*. p. 124. l. 21. r. *mercy*.
 127. l. 25. r. *Cornelius*. p. 127. l. 25. r. *Conversion*.
 127. l. 25. r. *Christian*. p. 143. l. 20. r. *the*.
 144. p. 154. l. 9. r. *God*. p. 156. l. 3. r. *the*.

things which are
 of God
 the Spirit of God
 the Spirit of God
 the Spirit of God